DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 339 777 UD 028 445

AUTHOR	Tashjian, Michael D.; And Others
TITLE	Unlocking Learning: Chapter 1 in Correctional Facilities. Descriptive Study Findings: National Study of the Chapter 1 Neglected or Delinquent Program.
INSTITUTION	Policy Studies Associates, Inc., Washington, DC.; Research and Training Associates, Inc., Overland Park, KS.; Westat, Inc., Rockville, MD.
SPONS AGENCY	Department of Education, Washington, DC. Office of the Under Secretary.
PUB DATE	91
CONTRACT	300-87-0124
NOTE	247p.; For related documents, see UD 028 443, and UD 028 446-447.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC10 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Adult Education; *Compensatory Education; *Correctional Education; Delinquent Rehabilitation; Educationally Disadvantaged; *Federal Programs; *Individual Characteristics; Individualized Instruction; *Institutionalized Persons; Program Administration; *Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; Secondary Education; Teacher Characteristics; Teaching Methods
IDENTIFIERS	*Hawkins Stafford Act 1988

ABSTRACT

Part of a 3-year study of the Chapter 1 Neglected or Delinquent (Chapter 1 N or D) Program, which provides compensatory education services to youth in state-operated juvenile and adult correctional facilities, this report presents descriptive findings in the following five areas: (1) characteristics of youth; (2) correctional education; (3) Chapter 1 N or D Program operations; (4) characteristics of teachers and instruction; and (5) administration of the Chapter 1 N or D Program. The study gathered information through reviews of extant information and a series of mail surveys and site visits. Findings indicate that most participants are male, black, from urban areas, and unemployed at the time of their commitment; and they averaged one prior commitment. Correctional education at youth facilities was less crowded than at adult facilities, and both levels have pragmatic educational goals. Chapter 1 N or D teachers and regular classroom teachers have similar experience, certification, employment status, and job satisfaction. Teachers select materials on the basis of student achievement, use standardized test scores in instructional decision making, and provide immediate feedback on student performance. Administration of these programs is complicated by the number and diversity of kinds of agencies involved, and the small amount of time devoted to administration. Included are 63 tables. Appended are procedures for portions of the study, results of the factor analysis of student attitude scales, and survey questionnaires. (JB)

ED339777

UNLOCKING LEARNING: CHAPTER 1 IN CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES

Descriptive Study Findings: National Study of the Chapter 1 Neglected or Delinquent Progam

Prepared for the U.S. Department of Education under contract by:

Westat, Inc.
Rockville, Maryland

In affiliation with:

Policy Studies Associates, Inc.
Washington, D.C.
and
Research & Training Associates, Inc.
Overland Park, Kansas

Contract No. 300-87-0124

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

UD 028 445

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION • OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

UNLOCKING LEARNING: CHAPTER 1 IN CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES

Descriptive Study Findings: National Study of the Chapter 1 Neglected or Delinquent Program

Michael D. Tashjian
Policy Studies Associates, Inc.

Linda A. LeBlanc
Westat, Inc.

Judy C. Pfannenstiel
Research & Training Associates, Inc.

1991

Prepared for the U.S. Department of Education
Office of the Under Secretary

Contract No. 300-87-0124

CONTENTS

CHAPTER		Page
	ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	vii
	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	viii
1.	INTRODUCTION AND STUDY OVERVIEW	1-1
	Purposes of this Study	1-3
	Study Methods	1-3
	Organization of this Report	1-6
2.	CHARACTERISTICS OF YOUTH	2-1
	Demographic Characteristics	2-3
	Educational Background and Achievement	2-5
	Employment Background	2-8
	Involvement with Criminal Justice System	2-9
	Student Attitudes	2-11
	Summary	2-15
3.	EDUCATION WITHIN THE CORRECTIONAL FACILITY	3-1
	Facility Characteristics	3-1
	Education Programs	3-3
	Budget and Staffing	3-4
	Programs Offered	3-8
	Numbers Served	3-9
	Student Selection	3-10
	Student Evaluation	3-12
	Support Services	3-14
	Summary	3-16
4.	CHAPTER 1 N OR D PROGRAM OPERATIONS	4-1
	Locus of the Program	4-1
	Levels of Student Participation	4-3
	Chapter 1 N or D Resource Allocations	4-6
	Chapter 1 N or D Services	4-11
	Summary	4-15
5.	CHARACTERISTICS OF TEACHERS AND INSTRUCTION	5-1
	Professional Experience	5-1
	Instructional Characteristics	5-8

CONTENTS (continued)

Page

Teaching Responsibilities and Use of Time 5-8
Resource Availability and Utilization 5-13
Instructional Methods 5-17
Administrative Leadership 5-24
Perceptions of Effectiveness 5-27
Summary 5-34

6. ADMINISTRATION OF THE CHAPTER 1 N OR D PROGRAM 6-1

Administrative Resources 6-1
Administrative Operations 6-3

Who Receives Services 6-4
Student/Eligibility Standards 6-4
Application Review and Approval 6-4
Funds Allocation 6-5
Program Compliance 6-7
Technical Assistance and Evaluation 6-8

Summary of Program Administration 6-12

7. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS 7-1

REFERENCES

APPENDIX

A Procedures for the Descriptive Study and Baseline Longitudinal Study Components of the Study of Chapter 1 Neglected or Delinquent Programs A-1

B Results of the Factor Analysis of Student Attitude Scales B-1

C Survey Questionnaires C-1

List of Tables

Table Page

2-1 Comparison of Chapter 1 Students with Eligible Nonparticipants in Facilities for Delinquent Youth and Adult Correctional Facilities 2-2

2-2 Age Distribution of Chapter 1 N or D Participants, by Type of Facility 2-4

2-3 Percent of Chapter 1 N or D Participants Reporting Persons Residing in the Same Household at Entry into Corrections System 2-5

List of Tables (continued)

Table		Page
2-4	Educational Status of Chapter 1 N or D Participants at Time of Most Recent Commitment, by Type of Facility	2-6
2-5	Employment Status of Chapter 1 N or D Participants at Time of Most Recent Commitment, by Type of Facility	2-8
2-6	Number of Weeks Since Sentencing or Adjudication and Number of Weeks at Current Facility for Chapter 1 N or D Students, by Type of Facility	2-10
2-7	Distribution of Chapter 1 N or D Students by Expected Length of Sentence	2-11
2-8	Average Number of Positive Student Responses per Factor for Chapter 1 N or D and Regular Students, by Type of Facility	2-12
2-9	Chapter 1 N or D Student Responses to Items Indicating Attitude Toward Education, by Type of Facility	2-13
2-10	Regular Education Student Responses to Items Indicating Attitude Toward Education, by Type of Facility	2-14
3-1	Education Allocation as a Percent of Total Facility Budget	3-5
3-2	Overall Staff Allocation, by Type of Facility	3-7
3-3	Allocation of Education Staff, by Type of Facility	3-7
3-4	Education Program Offered, by Type of Facility	3-8
3-5	Numbers of Students Receiving Various Regular Education Services, October 15, 1988, by Type of Facility	3-10
3-6	Incentives Used to Encourage Participation in Regular Education Program, by Type of Facility	3-12
3-7	Sources of Achievement Test Scores for Entering Students, by Type of Facility	3-13
3-8	Frequency of Student Achievement Testing, by Type of Facility	3-14
3-9	Support Services Offered, by Type of Facility	3-15
3-10	Selected Transitional Services Offered by Facilities, by Type of Facility	3-16
4-1	Locus of Chapter 1 N or D Program, by Type of Facility	4-2

List of Tables (continued)

Table		Page
4-2	Average Size of Chapter 1 N or D Program, by Type of Facility	4-3
4-3	Chapter 1 N or D Students as a Percentage of all Chapter 1 - Eligible Residents, by Type of Facility, 1976 and 1988	4-4
4-4	Reasons Why Not All Eligible Students Are Served, by Type of Facility	4-5
4-5	Chapter 1 N or D Expenditures as a Percent of Total Education Expenditures, by Category of Expenditure	4-8
4-6	Number of Chapter 1 N or D Staff Persons, by Type of Facility	4-10
4-7	Chapter 1 N or D Student-Staff Ratios, by Type of Facility	4-11
4-8	Chapter 1 N or D Instruction Offered, by Type of Facility	4-12
4-9	Classes Attended by Chapter 1 N or D Participants, by Type of Facility	4-13
4-10	Average Number of Hours Scheduled per Week for Chapter 1 N or D Participants, by Type of Class and Facility	4-14
5-1	Average Number of Years Experience for Chapter 1 N or D and Regular Program Teachers, by Type of Facility	5-3
5-2	Highest Level of Education for Chapter 1 N or D and Regular Program Teachers, by Type of Facility	5-5
5-3	Areas of Formal Course Work or Experience for Chapter 1 N or D and Regular Program Teachers, by Type of Facility	5-6
5-4	Teacher's Choice of Workplace for Chapter 1 N or D and Regular Program Teachers, by Type of Facility	5-7
5-5	Subjects Currently Taught by Chapter 1 N or D Teachers, by Type of Facility	5-8
5-6	Subjects Currently Taught by Regular Program Teachers, by Type of Facility	5-9
5-7	Average Number of Hours Spent per Week on Activities by Chapter 1 N or D and Regular Teachers, by Type of Facility	5-10
5-8	Average Percent of Time Spent on Selected Noninstructional Activities for Chapter 1 N or D and Regular Teachers, by Type of Facility	5-12

List of Tables (continued)

Table		Page
5-9	Average Percent of Time Students Are Actively Engaged in Academic Activities by Chapter 1 N or D and Regular Program Teachers, by Type Facility	5-12
5-10	Reasons for Student Absences Reported by Chapter 1 N or D and Regular Program Teachers, by Type of Facility	5-13
5-11	Problems Created by Security Measures, by Type of Facility	5-14
5-12	Percent of Teachers Indicating Insufficient Quantity of Materials and Ranking of Insufficient Quantities of Materials by Chapter 1 N or D and Regular Program Teachers and by Type of Facility	5-15
5-13	Basis of Choice of Materials for Teaching by Chapter 1 N or D and Regular Program Teachers, by Type of Facility	5-16
5-14	Progress Measurements Used by Chapter 1 N or D and Regular Program Teachers, by Type of Facility	5-18
5-15	Extent to Which Chapter 1 N or D and Regular Program Teachers Update Student Performance Objectives, by Type and Facility	5-19
5-16	Frequency of Occurrence of Selected Instructional Methods of Chapter 1 N or D Classroom Instruction, by Type of Facility	5-21
5-17	Frequency of Occurrence of Selected Instructional Methods in Regular Program Classroom Instruction, by Type of Facility	5-23
5-18	Frequency of Chapter 1 N or D Teacher Characteristics, by Type of Facility	5-24
5-19	Frequency of Meetings for Chapter 1 N or D and Regular Program Teachers, by Type of Facility	5-26
5-20	Chapter 1 N or D Teachers' Responses Regarding Attitudes and Behavior of Administrators Toward Chapter 1 N or D Programs, by Type of Facility	5-28
5-21	Regular Program Teachers' Responses Regarding Attitudes and Behavior of Administrators Toward Chapter 1 N or D Programs, by Type of Facility	5-29
5-22	Factors Identified by Chapter 1 N or D Teachers as Most Likely to Promote Learning, by Type of Facility	5-30

List of Tables (continued)

Table		Page
5-23	Factors Identified by Regular Program Teachers as Most Likely to Promote Learning, by Type of Facility	5-32
5-24	Factors Identified by Chapter 1 N or D Teachers as Most Likely to Obstruct Learning, by Type of Facility	5-33
5-25	Factors Identified by Regular Program Teachers as Most Likely to Obstruct Learning, by Type of Facility	5-35
6-1	Other Facility-Level Positions Currently Held by Chapter 1 N or D Coordinator's by Type of Facility	6-3
6-2	Most Important Method of Funds Allocation, by SAAs	6-5
6-3	Reasons Facilities With Eligible Residents Do Not Participate in the Chapter 1 N or D Program	6-6
6-4	Average Percent of Facilities Monitored On Site by SEA and SAA	6-7
6-5	Technical Assistance Provided by SEAs and SAAs to Facilities	6-9
6-6	Frequency and Content of Chapter 1 N or D Program Evaluations	6-10
6-7	Improvements Made as a Result of the Annual Evaluation, by Type of Facility	6-11
6-8	Most Important Problems in Administering the Chapter 1 N or D Program	6-13

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We would like to thank the persons who provided assistance and support during this study, particularly Daphne Hardcastle, the Contracting Officer's Technical Representative, who has provided consistently thoughtful guidance during all phases of our work and the study's advisory committee, who devoted time and expertise at critical points in the study:

Charles L. Conyers
Division of Special and Compensatory Programs
Virginia Department of Education

Robert Hable
Education and Employment Section
Wisconsin Division of Corrections

William M. Hennis
Division of Support Programs
North Carolina Department of Public Instruction

Michael Horrigan
Senior Labor Economist
Council of Economic Advisors

J. Ward Keesling
1976-80 National Evaluation of Title I Programs for Neglected or Delinquent Youth

Hy Steinberg
Formerly of Texas Youth Commission

G.H. Washington
Office of Educational Services
District of Columbia Department of Corrections

Bruce I. Wolford
Department of Correctional Services
Eastern Kentucky University

We are also especially grateful to all those persons who helped us obtain the information for the study. These persons include state education agency and state applicant agency coordinators of all the Chapter 1 N or D programs, education program administrators at 106 facilities across the country, and the teachers and students at 38 institutions who participated in our on-site data collection efforts.

Others who made important contributions to this study were Rosalind Hamar, a consultant to the study team; Juanita Lucas-McLean, David Judkins, Dave Wright, and Jean Pieranunzi of Westat, Inc.; Barbara Lawrence of Research & Training Associates, Inc.; and Joanne Bogart, Christene Petry, Michael Rubenstein, Margaret Thompson, and Brenda Turnbull of Policy Studies Associates (PSA), Inc.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The authorizing legislation in effect at the outset of this study was Chapter 1 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act (ECIA) of 1981. It has funded state agencies to provide educational services to neglected or delinquent (N or D) youth in state-operated facilities. The descriptive component of the Study of the Chapter 1 N or D Program was designed to address three broad research questions:

- What are the characteristics of the neglected or delinquent population, the types of services provided by correctional institutions, and the effects of those services?
- What educational and support services are provided by state-operated Chapter 1 N or D programs, what are the characteristics of N or D participants, and how do the program services and participant characteristics compare with those found in regular education programs?
- How is the Chapter 1 N or D program administered?

This report answers each of these questions in some detail. Here we provide a summary of findings in five key areas: (1) characteristics of youth, (2) correctional education, (3) Chapter 1 program operations, (4) characteristics of teachers and instruction, and (5) administration of the Chapter 1 program. The report discusses each of these subjects in separate chapters.

Characteristics of Youth

The demographic characteristics and preinstitutional experiences of Chapter 1 students and eligible but nonparticipating students are quite similar:

- Ninety-two percent of Chapter 1 N or D participants and 89 percent of eligible nonparticipants are male.
- Fifty-five percent of Chapter 1 N or D participants are black, and 25 percent are white; 51 percent of eligible nonparticipants are black, and 33 percent are white.

- Prior to entry into the facility 74 percent of participants and 71 percent of eligible nonparticipants lived in an urban area.

- At the time of their most recent commitment to a facility, 83 percent of participants and 87 percent of eligible nonparticipants were unemployed.

- Prior to commitment, 42 percent of participants and 40 percent of eligible nonparticipants were not attending school.

- Chapter 1 N or D participants and nonparticipants both averaged one prior commitment to a correctional facility.

In comparison with Chapter 1 N or D students in adult correctional facilities, such students in institutions for delinquent youth, are, on average, younger, more likely to have been in school at the time of commitment, and more likely to intend to return to school after release:

- In youth facilities, the average age for Chapter 1 N or D participants is 16.7, while in adult facilities the average age for participants is 19.9; 18 percent of adult facility participants are reportedly older than the prescribed maximum of 20 years of age.

- In youth facilities, two-thirds of Chapter 1 N or D participants were in school at the time of commitment, whereas in adult facilities less than one-third were in school prior to entry.

- In youth facilities, 83 percent of participants intend to return to school after release, whereas 66 percent of adult facility participants plan to reenter school after release.

- Some 62 percent of those participants in youth facilities who intend to return to school plan to attend high school, whereas vocational, technical, or business schools are the types of schools most frequently reported by adult facility participants (45 percent) who intend to continue their education.

Correctional Education

Youth facilities that operate Chapter 1 N or D programs are typically much smaller institutions than participating adult facilities and somewhat less crowded:

- Youth facilities have, on average, 140 inmates each, whereas adult institutions average 1,207 each.

- On average, adult institutions operate at 105 percent of capacity, compared with 94 percent of capacity for youth institutions.

Education is much more important to the operation of participating youth facilities than it is to participating adult facilities:

- Youth facilities have, on average, 120 students, representing 87 percent of the inmate population, while adult facilities average 390 students, or just 33 percent of the inmate population.
- Proportionately, participating youth facilities allocate approximately three times as much of their overall funds to education (15 percent) as adult facilities do (5 percent).
- On average, 13 percent of all youth facility staff and 6 percent of adult facility staff have education as their primary responsibility.

The educational goals and programs of all participating facilities tend to be more pragmatically oriented than do those of the public schools. Moreover, adult facility programs are somewhat more oriented toward preparing students for the world of work, whereas youth facility programs focus more on equipping students to reenter the public schools:

- The types of education courses most frequently offered and attended at youth facilities are high school classes and basic skills classes. Vocational education, adult basic education, and GED preparation are the classes most frequently offered and heavily attended classes at participating adult institutions.
- Youth facilities are three times as likely to test a student's achievement at exit from a facility and to provide such information to the exiting student's public school.
- Adult facilities are somewhat more likely to help identify employment opportunities for exiting students, whereas youth facilities are far more likely to help students register at local public schools.

The most frequent recommendations offered by school principals for improving corrections education include more funding, improved teacher and administrator commitment, more services/programs, more computers, and more classroom space. All these recommendations indicate a need to increase the priority of education in institutions, particularly as reflected in resource allocations.

Chapter 1 N or D Program Operations

The Chapter 1 N or D program is concentrated in institutions for delinquent youth.

- Facilities for delinquent youth account for 55 percent of all state-operated institutions that participate in the Chapter 1 N or D program, while 40 percent are adult correctional institutions and 5 percent are facilities for neglected youth.
- Some 59 percent of all state-operated delinquent youth facilities operate a Chapter 1 N or D program, compared with just 26 percent of adult correctional facilities. (Among facilities for neglected youth, 91 percent have a Chapter 1 N or D program.)
- Sixty percent of the students eligible to receive Chapter 1 N or D services are in facilities for delinquent youth, 37 percent in adult institutions, and 4 percent in facilities for neglected youth.
- Some 67 percent of all N or D participants in state-operated institutions are in facilities for delinquent youth, 28 percent in adult correctional facilities, and 5 percent in facilities for neglected children.

Students who are eligible to receive Chapter 1 N or D services in youth facilities are more likely to participate in the program than are eligible residents of adult facilities:

- Fifty-six percent of all eligible youth in youth facilities receive Chapter 1 N or D services, compared with 38 percent of the eligible youth in adult institutions.
- The reasons cited most frequently for not serving more eligible students in youth facilities are a lack of sufficient funds and a lack of classroom space, while in adult institutions the primary reasons are student refusal of services and inappropriate student behavior.
- The recommendations for improvement of the Chapter 1 N or D program most frequently offered by those responsible for coordination of the program at youth facilities are to increase funding and to add more classes and staff. At adult facilities the most frequent recommendations are to eliminate the age limit on eligibility and to increase funding.

The Chapter 1 N or D program represents a much greater part of the overall education program at participating youth facilities than it does in adult facilities with a Chapter 1 N or D program:

- Chapter 1 N or D funding provides about 14 percent of the total education budget at youth facilities and just 5 percent at adult institutions.
- Chapter 1 N or D staff represent 15 percent of the total education staff at participating youth facilities and 7 percent at adult institutions.
- Youth facilities average 3 Chapter 1 N or D-funded staff persons, compared with 1.5 for adult facilities.
- While the three Chapter 1 classes most frequently offered in both youth and adult institutions are reading, mathematics, and language arts, in 49 percent of adult facilities the three subjects are taught in a single class, compared with just 17 percent of youth facilities that provide combined Chapter 1 instruction in these areas.

On a per-pupil basis, Chapter 1 makes a larger contribution to participants' educational programs in adult facilities than in youth facilities:

- Chapter 1 accounts for 25 percent of the total per-pupil expenditure in youth facilities, compared with 54 percent in adult facilities.

The contribution made by Chapter 1 N or D funding in the areas of staff training and development, computers, and instructional aides is far greater than the overall 10 percent of the total education budget accounted for by Chapter 1 N or D funding in participating facilities:

- The Chapter 1 N or D program provides 43 percent of the total amount expended by participating facilities for computers.
- The Chapter 1 N or D program provides 21 percent of the total amount expended for staff training and development.
- Chapter 1 N or D funding supports 47 percent of all paid instructional aides at participating facilities.

Characteristics of Teachers and Instruction

Chapter 1 N or D teachers and regular classroom teachers have similar experience, certification, employment status, and job satisfaction:

- On average, Chapter 1 N or D and regular teachers have been teaching in their current facility for 7 years.
- All Chapter 1 N or D teachers and 95 percent of regular classroom teachers hold a valid teaching certificate, and 84 percent of each are certified in the areas in which they currently teach.
- Ninety-seven percent of Chapter 1 N or D and 96 percent of regular classroom teachers are full-time staff of the facility.
- If given the choice of instructional setting, 68 percent of Chapter 1 N or D and 67 percent of regular program teachers would choose to work at their present facility.

There is little variation between Chapter 1 N or D and regular classroom teachers in time allocations:

- Both Chapter 1 N or D and regular classroom teachers teach an average of five classes per day.
- Both Chapter 1 N or D and regular teachers spend an average of 37 hours per week on instructional tasks.
- Chapter 1 N or D teachers spend about 70 percent of their classroom time on academic interaction, compared with 61 percent for regular teachers.

Chapter 1 N or D and regular teachers differ in their instructional methods and materials:

- The materials most frequently used in both the Chapter 1 N or D and regular classrooms are workbooks, practice sheets, and teacher-made materials, but 80 percent of the Chapter 1 N or D teachers select these materials on the basis of student achievement, whereas only half of regular teachers use this criterion.
- Chapter 1 N or D teachers use life skills materials and computers more often than do regular classroom teachers, although both identified computers as the most needed resource.
- Chapter 1 N or D teachers are more likely to use standardized test scores for instructional decision making. ▪ Chapter 1 N or D teachers report providing immediate feedback on student performance more often than regular classroom teachers do.

Fifty-four percent of all Chapter 1 N or D teachers provide instruction in Chapter 1 reading, 39 percent in Chapter 1 mathematics, and 38 percent in Chapter 1 language arts. Thirty-

five percent combine instruction in these areas, and 32 percent provide social or life skills instruction.

Administration of the Chapter 1 N or D Program

Administration of the Chapter 1 N or D program is complicated by the number of agencies involved, the diversity in the types of agencies holding administrative responsibility, and the relatively small amount of time that the persons responsible for administering the program actually devote to it:

- Administration of the Chapter 1 N or D program involves state education agency (SEA) staff, staff of one or more state applicant agencies (SAAs), and facility-level staff.
- SAAs, the primary administrative agents of the program, may be state departments of corrections, state departments of youth services, specialized schools district, or community colleges. The SEA or facility may also act as the SAA.
- SEA Chapter 1 N or D coordinators allocate 19 percent of their time to program administration. Facility-level staff with administrative responsibility allocate, on average, 14 percent of their time to these duties. SAA Chapter 1 N or D coordinators devote 46 percent of their time to program administration.
- Seventy-seven percent of those persons responsible for facility-level administration of the Chapter 1 N or D program hold another position at the facility.

Administrative requirements of the Chapter 1 N or D program, particularly those associated with program and student evaluation, are perceived to be unduly burdensome:

- Some 59 percent of all facility-level, Chapter 1 N or D coordinators indicate that they believe that the annual program evaluation is not a useful measure of program success; "unrealistic federal guidelines" are the reason cited most frequently by these respondents.
- The biggest problems in the administration of the Chapter 1 N or D program for SAAs are evaluation issues and paperwork.
- SEAs and facility-level administrative staff find inadequate funding and a lack of congruence between Chapter 1 N or D and their primary administrative responsibilities (e.g., the basic Chapter 1 program and the regular education program in the facility, respectively) to be the biggest administrative problems.

All these findings point up a few broad issues that may have implications for federal policy or regulations governing the program:

First, appreciable differences between the populations and programs in youth facilities and those in adult facilities have important implications for education generally and Chapter 1 specifically. In essence, the Chapter 1 N or D program seems administratively illsuited for adult correctional institutions, as evidenced by a low percentage of eligible residents served, the stated reasons why more are not served, and the fact that 18 percent of Chapter 1 students in adult facilities exceed the prescribed age for eligibility. However, although the Chapter 1 N or D program is a small and somewhat awkward part of the total education program at many adult institutions, for those students who do participate in the program in such facilities, the contribution to their education is substantial.

The second main finding is that there is a widespread perception among state and facility staff involved with the program that its administration is unduly burdensome, particularly the evaluation requirements. This finding seems to suggest that a less-restrictive regulatory structure should be used to administer the Chapter 1 program in state-operated institutions -- one that acknowledges the universality of need among the population and the special constraints imposed by the corrections environment on activities such as student evaluation.

With respect to the issue of funding, the ideal, from the practitioner perspective, would be to increase the total amount appropriated to the Chapter 1 N or D program. In light of the current Federal budget situation and the fact that the Chapter 1 N or D program has been level-funded for the past 6 years, significant increases seem unlikely. Hence the issue becomes one of allocation of relatively static resources.

1. INTRODUCTION AND STUDY OVERVIEW

Chapter 1 of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965, as amended, authorizes the Department of Education to provide financial assistance to disadvantaged students through grants to state education agencies (SEAs).[1] Of the $4.5 billion currently appropriated for Chapter 1 programs, $3.8 billion -- 84 percent -- is designated for basic grants to programs operated by local school districts. In addition, Chapter 1 authorizes federal funding for state-operated programs designed to assist migratory children, handicapped children, and neglected and delinquent (N or D) children. The Chapter 1 N or D program was established in 1967, through amendments to ESEA.

The Chapter 1 N or D program, funded at about $32 million for each of the past 6 years, awards grants to SEAs, which then allocate funds to state applicant agencies (SAAs). SAAs, the chief administrative agents of the Chapter 1 N or D program, may be state departments of corrections or youth services, special school districts for corrections education, community or technical colleges, local educational agencies, or facilities themselves. In some states the SEA also acts as the SAA. SAAs, in turn, award Chapter 1 N or D funds to eligible institutions under their jurisdiction.

Currently, four types of organizations that may receive funding under the N or D program:

1. Institutions for neglected children,
2. Institutions for delinquent children,
3. Community day programs for neglected and delinquent children, and
4. Adult correctional institutions.

Services to youth in adult correctional institutions were first authorized through amendments to ESEA in 1972. Two types of youth in adult correctional facilities may be eligible

---

[1]The authorizing legislation in effect at the outset of this study was Chapter 1 of the Education Consolidation and Implement Act (ECIA) of 1981.

for Chapter 1 services: those who have reached the age of majority and are considered adults (generally 18 through 20) and those who are still classified as minors but whose offense or behavior warrants treatment in the adult criminal justice system.

To be eligible for Chapter 1 N or D services, an inmate must be under 21 years of age, lack a high school diploma or its equivalent, and participate for at least 10 hours per week in a regular educational program supported by nonfederal funds for which daily attendance records are kept. To be eligible for Chapter 1 N or D funding, institutions must house at least 10 inmates who meet these criteria. The regulations for the Chapter 1 N or D program further stipulate that eligible institutions are those which operate to care for children who have had an average length of stay at the institution of at least 30 days.

The regulations for the Chapter 1 N or D program also require that funded programs be designed to meet "the special educational needs" of participants, as measured by an annual assessment of the educational needs of institutionalized youth. Moreover, Chapter 1 N or D services must be supplemental to the basic education provided by the state.

Since the inception of the Chapter 1 N or D program, three studies of it have been conducted. In 1977, the U.S. General Accounting Office (GAO) examined the program and assessed how it related to the broader social issues of juvenile delinquency and child abuse and neglect (GAO, 1977). A large, multiyear study, also conducted in the late 1970s, examined Chapter 1 N or D program participant characteristics, effective practices, and students' postrelease experiences (Bartell, Keesling, and Pfannenstiel, 1977 - 1980). The third study examined program administration and operations in a limited number of states (Marks, 1986).

Hence it has been more than 10 years since nationally representative data regarding the Chapter 1 N or D program have been available to federal policymakers and Chapter 1 program staff. In the intervening decade the size of the nation's institutionalized population has steadily increased and many institutions have become severely overcrowded. At the same time, the need for educational services in correctional facilities has far exceeded the amount of available funds (Norton and Simms, 1988).

To obtain current information on the Chapter 1 N or D program as it operates within the larger context of correctional education, the Office of Planning, Budget, and Evaluation of the U.S. Department of Education contracted with Westat, Inc., along with its subcontractors Policy

Studies Associates and Research & Training Associates, to undertake a 3-year, multidimensional study of the program.

Purposes of this Study

The Study of the Chapter 1 Neglected or Delinquent program was designed to accomplish five broad objectives:

1. To review existing information about characteristics of the juvenile population, the types of services provided by correctional institutions, and the effects of those programs;

2. To describe the educational and support services provided by state-operated Chapter 1 N or D programs and the characteristics of program participants, and to compare program services and participant characteristics with regular education programs;

3. To provide information on state administration of the program;

4. To describe the experiences of Chapter 1 participants and to compare the experiences of eligible youth who do not receive Chapter 1 services; and

5. To identify and describe effective practices in the N or D program.

The research project comprises three major component studies: (1) a descriptive study of the Chapter 1 N or D program, (2) a longitudinal study of program participants, and (3) an effective practices study. The descriptive study, for which this document is the report, was designed to accomplish the first three objectives. The longitudinal study and effective practices study address the remaining objectives in separate reports.[2]

Study Methods

This report of descriptive study findings presents information obtained through four activities: (1) a review of extant information on institutionalized youths and the Chapter 1 N or D program, (2) mail surveys of the universes of SEAs and SAAs, (3) a mail survey of a nationally

[2] Student-level data collected during the descriptive study and reported herein are the baseline for the longitudinal study of participants.

representative sample of 120 facilities receiving Chapter 1 N or D funds, and (4) site visits to a subsample of 40 of these 120 facilities.

An advisory panel, consisting largely of state-level personnel who deal with correctional education and interested federal officials, has helped guide the research. The panel convened twice during the conduct of the descriptive study and provided individual and collective input, at critical junctures during the study verbally and in writing.

The review of existing literature, submitted to the Department of Education in April of 1988, along with guidance provided by the study's advisory panel, helped to refine the of research issues and to specify items for inclusion in study instruments.

Questionnaires were distributed to all SEAs and SAAs in late fall of 1988; responses were accepted through July 1989, in order to obtain the highest possible response rates. All 51 SEAs responded to the survey, and 75 of the 80 SAAs eligible for participation completed a survey, resulting in response rates of 100 percent and 94 percent, respectively.

Study staff distributed mail questionnaires for the Survey of State-operated Delinquent Youth and Adult Correctional Facilities to the cognizant SEAs or SAAs for distribution to the 120 sampled facilities in January 1989. Because only about 5 percent of all Chapter 1 N or D participants are in institutions for neglected youth and because these institutions are unlike the majority of participating facilities, these institutions were not included in the sampling frame from which the 120 facilities were selected. However, to obtain comprehensive information on state-operated programs, SAAs were asked to provide information on the number of facilities for neglected youth under their administration, as well as on the numbers of eligible students, Chapter 1 N or D participants, and Chapter 1 N or D instructional staff in such facilities. As this study was designed to describe the Chapter 1 N or D program in state-operated institutions, community day programs for neglected and delinquent children were excluded from all data collection. Ninety percent of the sampled facilities responded to the survey.

Recruitment of the 40 state-operated delinquent youth and adult correctional facilities for participation in the site visits began in March 1989. Two of the 40 facilities no longer operated a Chapter 1 program at the time of the mail survey and recruitment and were therefore ineligible for the study. All of the remaining 38 sites agreed to participate.

Two-person teams spent 1 to 3 days collecting data at each site; the length of time varied with the size of the particular facility. Each team --

- Completed a structured interview with the facility's education program administrator or school principal;
- Completed a structured interview with the person most knowledgeable about the Chapter 1 program at the facility (the Chapter 1 coordinator);
- Distributed and collected completed questionnaires from two regular education program teachers and up to three Chapter 1 teachers;
- Administered a questionnaire to random samples of Chapter 1 participants and eligible nonparticipants;
- Completed student record abstracts for each of the sampled students, from facility records;
- Completed of a facility observation form; and
- Completed two Chapter 1 N or D classroom observation forms.

Response rates to interviews and questionnaires facility staff among ranged from 95 to 100 percent. Response rates among students ranged from 86 to 90 percent.

While onsite, project staff also verified selected items from the facility mail survey and obtained information from facility staff on how best to proceed with followup data collection from sampled Chapter 1 students for the longitudinal component of the project.

Once the data from the facility questionnaire and the various site instruments had been coded, cleaned, weighted, and analyzed, the study staff submitted preliminary tabulations to ED and briefed ED staff on preliminary findings in August 1989.

All data obtained from study samples (e.g., the facility mail survey and on-site data collection at 38 facilities) have been weighted to provide nationally representative estimates. The procedures used in selecting study samples and assigning weights to the data are described in Appendix A.

Organization of this Report

Chapter 2 of this report presents an overview of the demographic characteristics, educational experiences, perceptions, and attitudes of Chapter 1 N or D participants and eligible nonparticipants. Chapter 3 describes education in the correctional setting as a framework for subsequent analyses of the role of the Chapter 1 program in this environment. Chapter 4 summarizes Chapter 1 N or D program operations, and Chapter 5 examines classroom practices and details the qualifications, training, and experience of Chapter 1 N or D and regular education teachers. Chapter 6 discusses the administration of the Chapter 1 N or D program by state agencies and facilities. Finally, Chapter 7 summarizes key findings from the descriptive study and suggests possible future directions for the Chapter 1 N or D program.

2. CHARACTERISTICS OF YOUTH

State-operated facilities for delinquent youth and adult correctional facilities reported that 18,588 students were receiving Chapter 1 N or D services on or about October 15, 1988. Given the transience of the youth population in correctional facilities, the total number of students served by the Chapter 1 N or D program varies from day to day. On that date, 13,514 -- 73 percent -- were residents of facilities for delinquent youth.

The total number of students served represents about one-half of the Chapter 1-eligible population residing in participating correctional facilities on that date, using the federal definition of program eligibility.[1] In participating youth facilities, approximately 59 percent of those eligible under the federal guidelines were served, compared with just 36 percent of eligible youth in participating adult correctional facilities.

One of the purposes of this study was to examine the characteristics of Chapter 1 N or D program participants and to compare them with those of eligible youth who are not participating. The profile of Chapter 1 participants and eligible nonparticipants developed from the student-level data shows few differences between the two groups in terms of education attainment, demographics, attitudes, experiences with the criminal justice system, or plans for the future. Table 2-1 summarizes some of the key characteristics on which the two categories of youth were compared.

The minor percentage differences in the demographics of the two groups are all within the range of sampling error and thus do not indicate any statistical differences between participants and nonparticipants. The typical student eligible for Chapter 1 N or D, regardless of participation status, is male, and a majority of eligible students are black. The average age of eligible students is between 17 and 18 years old. The highest grade completed, on average, is the eighth grade, but most were not attending school at the time of commitment to the correctional system.

[1] Federal eligibility guidelines specify that students must be under 21, have no high school diploma or its equivalent, and be enrolled in a regular educational program supported by nonfederal funds, for which daily attendance records are kept, for at least 10 hours per week.

Table 2-1. Comparison of Chapter 1 Students with Eligible Nonparticipants in Facilities for Delinquent Youth and Adult Correctional Facilities

Characteristic	Chapter 1 N or D Participants	Eligible Nonparticipants
Age	17.5 years	17.2 years
Gender	92% male	89% male
Race		
White, not Hispanic	25%	33%
Black, not Hispanic	55%	51%
Hispanic	18%	10%
Other	2%	6%
Not in school at time of commitment	42%	39%
No known disabling condition	55%	66%
Average time at current facility	28 weeks	28 weeks
First commitment	46%	34%
Prior time in correctional facilities	5.3 months	6.0 months

SOURCE: Student Record Abstract.

Table reads: The average age of Chapter 1 students in participating facilities is 17.5 years, while eligible nonparticipants in these facilities average 17.2 years of age.

Nonparticipants are somewhat more likely than Chapter 1 participants to have no known disabling condition. Participants are more likely than nonparticipants to be incarcerated for the first time, contributing to an overall lower average length of time spent in correctional facilities (5.3 months versus 6 months). On average, both types of students have been at the facility for 28 weeks, and the median expected length of sentence is the same for participants and nonparticipants: 19 months in facilities for delinquent youth, and 48 months in adult correctional facilities.*

* Expected length of sentence is based on court sentencing; most residents will spend less than the time sentenced in the correctional facility.

Although we found few differences between program participants and eligible nonparticipants, important variations in the characteristics of youth are evident when examined by the type of facility in which they reside. The remainder of this section examines in more detail the characteristics of youth receiving Chapter 1 N or D services.

Demographic Characteristics

Chapter 1 N or D programs in facilities for delinquent youth provide services to a distinctly younger population than do programs in adult correctional facilities. The average age of Chapter 1 N or D participants in facilities for youth is 17 years, whereas the average age of those in adult correctional institutions is 20 years. Table 2-2 compares the distribution of students by age in the two types of facilities. As can be seen from the table, 90 percent of the Chapter 1 N or D students in youth facilities are 18 or younger, whereas in adult facilities 80 percent of those receiving services are over 18. Nearly one-fifth of Chapter 1 N or D participants in adult facilities are 21 years of age or older, although program requirements prohibit services to this age group. In subsequent chapters of this report, we discuss the influence of the variation in age on education programs within youth and adult facilities, and identify the age limit on eligibility as a particularly troublesome aspect of the program in the adult facilities.

Most Chapter 1 N or D participants, regardless of their age or the type of facility in which they are currently located, share a common domestic background. Nearly three-quarters of participants reported that they lived in an urban area prior to entry into the facility, and nearly the same proportion indicated that their father did not live in the same household at the time of their commitment. As shown in the Table 2-3, only 12 percent of Chapter 1 N or D participants lived with both of their biological parents prior to commitment. In the case folders we reviewed, psychological and other counseling staff had often noted the significance of the lack of a male role model in the development of the institutionalized youth we sampled, particularly for male residents, who account for 92 percent of Chapter 1 N or D participants. The absence of a father figure, or male role model, was often cited as a major impediment to successful rehabilitation or treatment.

Table 2-2. Age Distribution of Chapter 1 N or D Participants, by Type of Facility

	Percent of Chapter 1 Participants		
	Youth Facility (n = 10,940)	Adult Facility (n = 3,408)	Total (n = 14,348)
13 or younger	1	0	1
14	5	0	4
15	15	0	11
16	25	0	19
17	34	9	28
18	11	10	11
19	6	26	11
20	3	36	11
21 +	1	18	5
Total	101%	99%	101%

SOURCE: Student Questionnaire.

NOTE: Columns do not add to 100 percent because of rounding.

The lack of a father's presence in the household is further reflected in the data obtained on sources of family support or income. Although information was not available in 30 percent of the sampled students' records, among those for whom such information was available the most frequently reported sources of income were mother's employment (33 percent) and public assistance (25 percent). Only 17 percent came from homes with income from two parents, and only 9 percent came from homes where the father's employment provided the sole income.

Table 2-3. Percent of Chapter 1 N or D Participants Reporting Persons Residing in the Same Household at Entry into Corrections System

Persons living in same household	Percent of Chapter 1 Participants
Mother only	43
Mother and father	12
Mother and stepfather	9
Foster parents	3
Father and stepmother	2
Other relative	12
Alone/spouse/friend	5
Other arrangement	14
Total	100%

SOURCE: Student Record Abstract.

We also obtained information on the participants' home environment through a series of questions regarding availability of certain resources that might facilitate learning. Sixty percent indicated that they did have a specific place to study in their home. A majority of program participants also indicated having access to a dictionary (79 percent), a daily newspaper (74 percent), and an encyclopedia (54 percent). Only 34 percent reported having an atlas at home, and 27 percent indicated having a computer.

Educational Background and Achievement

Perhaps one of the greatest distinctions between the youth population served by the Chapter 1 N or D program and that served by the basic grant program in the local schools is that few assumptions may be made about the Chapter 1 N or D students' continuity of participation in a regular education program. As Table 2-4 indicates, 42 percent of all N or D participants for

whom such data were available, including 76 percent of those in adult institutions, were not in school at the time of their most recent commitment.

Table 2-4. Educational Status of Chapter 1 N or D Participants at Time of Most Recent Commitment, by Type of Facility

Status	Percent of Chapter 1 Participants		
	Youth Facility (n=9,633)	Adult Facility (n=2,544)	Total (n=12,177)
Not in school	33	76	42
In regular public school	56	19	47
In special public or private school	9	0	7
In other school	2	4	3
Total	100%	99%	99%

SOURCE: Student Record Abstract.

NOTE: Some columns do not add to 100 percent because of rounding.

Because so many participants in adult institutions were not in school at commitment, the highest grade completed by participants in youth and adult facilities is quite similar, despite the age differential. According to data reported by participants in youth facilities, a mean of 8.7 years of school had been completed, compared with a mean of 9.2 for participants in adult facilities. The reported medians were 9 and 10 years, respectively.

We also attempted to collect data on last grade completed through our reviews of student records at the facility, although in many cases such information was not available. The available data indicate that the mean highest grade completed by Chapter 1 N or D participants was the eighth grade. It is difficult to know whether the information from student records is any more reliable than that reported by the students themselves, because many facilities obtain this information from the youth at entry into the facility, rather than from official records such as

school transcripts. Nevertheless, it is relatively safe to say that, on average, Chapter 1 N or D participants had completed the eighth grade prior to entry into the facility.

Many of the students participating in Chapter 1 N or D have been to more schools than the standard sequence of elementary school, middle school, and high school would require. One-quarter have changed schools less than three times since the first grade (the minimum number of changes to be expected given the standard sequence). Thirty percent reported having changed schools three or four times since first grade, which means that they have attended four or five schools, and 44 percent have attended six or more schools since first grade. (One percent of those asked were unable to recall or otherwise did not respond to this question.)

In most facilities, standardized achievement tests are administered to incoming youth. Tests used vary considerably by facility type. In adult institutions the Test of Adult Basic Education or the Adult Basic Learning Examination is administered to more than 90 percent of students. About one-third of students in youth facilities take these tests. Another third take the Woodcock-Johnson Psycho-educational Battery, and 13 percent take the Wide Range Achievement Test (WRAT).

Identifying actual levels of student achievement on the basis of facility records proved impossible in this study. Where students' records include such information, it is often maintained in a form that precludes meaningful aggregation.

Most Chapter 1 N or D participants have a positive perception of how they were faring in the last school they attended, with 62 percent indicating that they were doing either very well or pretty well in school before entering the facility. A substantial majority of the students (79 percent) also plan to go back to school after leaving the facility. The N or D students in youth facilities are more likely to have such plans (83 percent) than their older counterparts in adult facilities (66 percent).*

There is also a difference between inmates of the two types of facilities with respect to the types of schools they plan to enter after leaving the facility. Of those Chapter 1 participants in youth facilities who plan to return to school, 64 percent expect to return to high school, compared with 17 percent of those in adult institutions who plan to reenter school. Forty-five percent of the

* Among Chapter 1 N or D participants not planning to attend school after release, the most frequently reported reason was that they had to work, reported by 63 percent of those not planning to go to school.

participants in adult institutions who plan to go back to school identified vocational, technical, or business schools, while another 17 percent intend to enter a 2-year college. After high school, the types of schools that Chapter 1 N or D participants in youth institutions most frequently reported planning to enter upon release are vocational, technical, or business schools (13 percent).

Employment Background

Chapter 1 N or D participants in youth facilities were more likely to have been in school prior to entry in a facility, participants in adult institutions were more likely to have had some form of employment, as shown in Table 2-5.

Table 2-5. Employment Status of Chapter 1 N or D Participants at Time of Most Recent Commitment, by Type of Facility

Status	Percent of Chapter 1 Participants		
	Youth Facility (n=2,971)	Adult Facility (n=11,319)	Total (n=8,348)
Employed full time	3	18	6
Employed part time	12	7	10
Employed (full time or part time unknown)	0	5	1
Unemployed	38	53	43
Never employed	47	17	40
Total	100%	100%	100%

SOURCE: Student Record Abstract.

Nearly half of the program participants in youth facilities have never been employed, and 85 percent were unemployed at the time of commitment. Although adult facility participants

are more likely to have worked at some point in the past, a majority of them also were unemployed at the time of commitment.

Involvement With Criminal Justice System

Chapter 1 N or D participants in correctional facilities have most often been institutionalized for committing crimes against persons (41 percent) and crimes against property (33 percent). Participants in adult institutions are somewhat more likely than youth facility participants to have been institutionalized for crimes against persons. Drug offenses are the primary recorded reason for institutionalization for 20 percent. Truancy, possession of a weapon, driving under the influence, and violation of probation/parole account for the remaining 6 percent.

For 46 percent of these students, their current commitment is their first, while 26 percent have had one prior commitment and the remainder more than one. Among youth in facilities for delinquent youth, the number of prior commitments averages 1.2, while the number of prior commitments for those in adult correctional facilities averages 0.9. Youth incarcerated in facilities for delinquent youth typically had their first involvement with the criminal justice system at age 13; for those in the adult system, the age was typically 17.5.

Many Chapter 1 N or D students received treatment or other services while in the community at some time prior to their incarceration. In this area there was little difference in experiences according to type of facility. Probation was the most frequently reported prior rehabilitation, with 57 percent of the Chapter 1 N or D population having been on probation at some point. Parole was reported for 7 percent of the students, and some other type of corrections supervision was reported for 37 percent. Schools for youth in need of special services had served 11 percent of these students. Mental health counseling (20 percent) and admission to a mental health facility (10 percent) were also among the services previously provided.

On average, 45 weeks had elapsed since sentencing or adjudication for Chapter 1 N or D participants and 28 weeks since commitment to the current facility. The elapsed times are longer in adult institutions, and in both settings the distributions are skewed toward shorter times (Table 2-6).

Table 2-6. Number of Weeks Since Sentencing or Adjudication and Number of Weeks at Current Facility for Chapter 1 N or D Students, by Type of Facility

	Number of Weeks	
	Youth Facility	Adult Facility
Weeks since sentenced		
Mean	40	58
Median	27	37
Weeks at current facility		
Mean	27	32
Median	21	23

SOURCE: Student Record Abstract.

The amount of time that Chapter 1 students can expect to spend in the correctional facility, based on the conditions of sentencing or adjudication, also varies by type of facility, and experience varies with factors such as time off for good behavior. Overall, length of sentence averages 4.6 years, but it is 2.8 years among those in facilities for youth and 7.5 years among those in adult correctional facilities. The median expected length of sentence indicates that the limited number of students with very long sentences drives the average up. The median expected lengths of sentence are 1.7 years in facilities for youth and 2.0 years in adult correctional facilities. Table 2-7 compares the expected lengths of sentences for students in the two types of facilities.

Table 2-7. Distribution of Chapter 1 N or D Students by Expected Length of Sentence

Length of Sentence	Percent of Chapter 1 Participants	
	Youth Facility	Adult Facility
1-6 months	21	0
7-12 months	12	9
1-2 years	31	13
2-4 years	17	7
5-7 years	6	24
7^{+} years	3	31
	90%	81%

SOURCE: Student Record Abstract.

Student Attitudes

Students in Chapter 1 N or D classes and in regular classes responded to 26 attitudinal items designed to measure self-esteem, locus of control (the perception of one's ability or inability to influence outcomes), and attitudes toward teachers and learning. These items were similar to attitudinal scales included in the previous national evaluation of Chapter I N or D programs conducted more than a decade ago (Keesling et al., 1979). Factor analytic results for scale construction of these attitudinal items are contained in Appendix B.

Scale averages for Chapter 1 N or D and regular students are shown in Table 2-8. Overall, there were no significant differences in self-esteem or attitudes toward learning between Chapter 1 students and regular students or between types of facility. However, the Chapter 1 participants did express significantly lower feelings of internal control than did their regular student counterparts. Students in youth facilities expressed significantly more internal feelings of control than did students in adult facilities.

Table 2-8. Average Number of Positive Student Responses per Factor for Chapter 1 N or D and Regular Students, by Type of Facility

	Total Possible Positive Responses	Youth Facility (n) Mean	Adult Facility (n) Mean	Total (n) Mean
Chapter 1				
Locus of control	12	(271) 7.8	(185) 7.4	(456) 7.7
Attitude toward learning	5	(299) 3.7	(201) 3.9	(500) 3.8
Self-esteem	6	(299) 5.0	(206) 5.1	(505) 5.0
Regular				
Locus of control	12	(172) 8.7	(65) 8.3	(237) 8.6
Attitude toward learning	5	(183) 3.6	(64) 3.6	(247) 3.6
Self-esteem	6	(178) 5.1	(75) 5.2	(253) 5.1

SOURCE: Survey of Students.

Although there are no differences in overall scale means for the attitudes toward learning, analysis of individual items yielded important descriptive data as well as some significant differences between students (Tables 2-9 and 2-10). Eighty-eight percent of Chapter 1 N or D students and 83 percent of regular students believe they are learning things that they will need to know when they leave the institution. Eighty-one percent of Chapter 1 students and 76 percent of regular students agreed that they are learning a lot in their classes. Thus students overwhelmingly believe that they are learning and that they are learning skills needed upon their release. Although 61 percent of students agreed that they are learning a lot more in the institutional school than they were in their previous school, 39 percent disagreed.

Table 2-9. Chapter 1 N or D Student Responses to Items Indicating Attitude Toward Education, by Type of Facility

(Percent)

Item	Youth Facility				Adult Facility				Total			
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
I am learning a lot in my classes	39	39	14	8	47	41	3	9	41	40	11	8
I am learning things that I will need to know when I leave here	48	40	7	4	53	36	6	5	49	39	7	4
Teachers here care what happens when I leave here	23	31	22	25	24	36	24	17	23	32	22	23
My teachers tell me when I am doing well	35	51	12	3	38	52	8	1	36	51	11	2
Compared to the last school I attended, I'm learning a lot more here	36	23	18	22	34	32	18	16	36	25	18	21

SOURCE: Student Questionnaire.

NOTE: Rows, by institution type, may not add to 100 percent because of rounding.

Table 2-10. Regular Education Student Responses to Items Indicating Attitude Toward Education, by Type of Facility

(Percent)

Item	Youth Facility				Adult Facility				Total			
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
I am learning a lot in my classes	42	34	14	9	34	38	13	15	41	35	14	10
I am learning things that I will need to know when I leave here	53	30	11	6	37	45	6	13	51	32	10	7
Teachers here care what happens when I leave here	22	37	24	18	19	32	28	21	21	36	24	19
My teachers tell me when I am doing well	35	48	13	4	32	43	22	4	35	48	14	4
Compared to the last school I attended, I'm learning a lot more here	40	22	22	16	31	20	24	25	39	22	22	17

SOURCE: Student Questionnaire.

NOTE: Rows, by institution type, may not add to 10 percent because of rounding.

Overall, students disagreed most frequently with the statement that "teachers here care what happens when I leave here." About 45 percent of students overall disagreed with this statement; 25 percent strongly disagreed. Chapter 1 N or D students disagreed with greater frequency than did regular students. Regular students in adult facilities disagreed most frequently, with almost half of these students expressing disagreement.

Chapter 1 students more frequently agreed with the statements, "I am learning a lot in my classes," "I am learning things that I will need to know when I leave here," and "My teachers tell me when I am doing well."

Summary

Examination of the characteristics of Chapter 1 N or D participants and eligible nonparticipants reveals little difference between the two populations in demographics, education attainment, employment history, and involvement with the criminal justice system. There are, however, important differences between Chapter 1 N or D participants in youth facilities and those in adult correctional institutions.

Chapter 1 students in facilities for delinquent youth are a distinctly younger population than program participants in adult facilities. Youth facility residents are more likely to have been in school at the time of commitment and are more likely to plan to return to school, notably high school, after their release. Chapter 1 students in adult institutions, in contrast, are more likely to have some work experience; among those who plan to return to school, vocational, technical, or business schools are the most frequently reported destinations.

There are also important similarities among the students at each type of facility. Chapter 1 students in both types of facilities are overwhelmingly male and likely to have come from a home where the natural father is missing and where the mother's income or public assistance is the primary source of family support. Chapter 1 N or D students have, on average, completed at least the eighth grade and were typically unemployed at the time of commitment. Slightly more than half of all Chapter 1 N or D students have had prior commitments to a facility, and 57 percent have been on probation at some point in their past.

No relationship was found to exist between Chapter 1 N or D participants' locus of control and their attitudes toward learning. A sizable majority of Chapter 1 students believe they are learning a lot in their classes and that they are learning what they will need to know once they have left the institution.

The next chapter describes education in the correctional setting and the influence of participant and institutional characteristics on the education programs offered by youth and adult facilities.

3. EDUCATION WITHIN THE CORRECTIONAL FACILITY[1]

Administrative commitment and resource allocation often reflect a low priority for education services in the corrections environment. Confinement, protection from physical harm, and the provision of food, clothing, and shelter are the fundamental responsibilities of correctional systems. Rehabilitative efforts, while important, are typically secondary concerns. Moreover, education is only one of several rehabilitative activities in most correctional facilities. Counseling for psychological and substance abuse problems, for example, may be equally important rehabilitative activities.

The youth receiving services in correctional systems are perhaps the most educationally and economically disadvantaged in the country. The level of poverty among institutional residents far exceeds the national average, and academic achievement is generally much lower than average. Moreover, many institutionalized youths must overcome psychological or learning disabilities, not to mention the effects of broken families and a history of involvement with the criminal justice system. Thus correctional educators are charged with educating those most in need in an environment where education is not paramount.

This chapter first provides an overview of correctional facilities participating in the Chapter 1 program, highlighting those characteristics that help shape the scope and nature of education programs. Then it examines education programs in these correctional facilities, and summarizes support and transitional services.

Facility Characteristics

Education in the corrections environment takes place in two different types of institutions: juvenile delinquent facilities that serve youth exclusively, and adult correctional institutions that serve both youth and adult residents. (Some adults facilities separate youthful offenders from other inmates.) Of all facilities participating in the Chapter 1 N or D program, 55 percent are delinquent youth facilities and 40 percent are adult correctional facilities. (The

---

[1] Unless otherwise noted, data presented in this chapter are from the mail survey of facilities.

remaining 5 percent serve neglected youth.) Facilities for delinquent youth generally place a higher priority on education than adult facilities do because nearly all residents share, by virtue of age alone, a fundamental need for education services. In adult facilities, youth are the minority population, and rehabilitation programs available in such facilities are shaped by the needs of older residents--needs that often pertain more to work than to school.

The two types of correctional facilities also differ in size, existence of overcrowded conditions, average length of time residents are held, and other factors that influence the scope and quality of a facility's education program. In general, adult facilities are much larger institutions and more likely to be crowded. Among adult facilities participating in Chapter 1, the average number of residents on a given day in 1988 averaged 1,207, nearly nine times more than the average of 140 residents per participating youth facility. Also, adult facilities on average were 5 percent above capacity, whereas youth facilities averaged 6 percent below capacity.

Overcrowding frequently results in reducing the space available for education programs in favor of higher priorities such as confinement or work programs. More than two-thirds of education program administrators reported limited facility space as a problem in meeting student learning needs within their institutions. When asked to provide recommendations for improving corrections education, 38 percent of principals in adult facilities cited more classroom space, the recommendation offered most often after increased funding.

Education programs in youth facilities generally benefit from the facilities' exclusive focus on youth, relatively small size, and lack of crowding. One feature of youth facilities that presents problems for attaining educational objectives, however, is the shorter length of time inmates are confined. The average length of stay for inmates released from participating youth facilities in 1988 was approximately 8 months, compared with about 20 months for inmates leaving the adult institutions. In nearly 40 percent of the youth facilities, inmates are held for only 6 months or less. The brevity of student tenure in any one education program, particularly given the prevalence of disadvantaged backgrounds, poses obvious constraints on the ability of even the best programs to have measurable effects on student achievement.

Finally, inmates of juvenile institutions are less likely to have committed violent offenses and more likely to be held in minimum security environments. On average, 43 percent of all residents in the youth facilities were held in minimum security environments in 1988, compared

with 27 percent in the adult prisons. With a larger percentage of their residents requiring higher levels of security, adult institutions are left with relatively fewer resources to allocate to rehabilitation.

Education Programs

Regardless of type, most participating institutions (81 percent) provide education services in a school building located on the grounds of the facility. One-third of the adult facilities and 42 percent of the youth facilities also provide services in residential buildings. In some facilities students placed in lockup -- 24-hour confinement to a cell -- because of to violation of facility rules, receive instruction in their cells for a portion of each day. Instructional activities occur off facility grounds in only 4 percent of participating institutions.

School activities are directed by an education program administrator, or principal, who, on average, has held that job for about 5 years. Principals frequently hold other positions in the education program, such as Chapter 1 coordinator (39 percent) or teacher (10 percent). Principals in the youth facilities are more likely than their counterparts in the adult institutions to hold another position as well. In fact, facility superintendents serve as the school principal at 11 percent of all the youth facilities, a situation that probably benefits the education function in many of these institutions.

Nearly all school principals report having a written statement of goals for the education program; the goals most frequently mentioned are providing academic and vocational education (81 percent), improving community functioning (30 percent), and emphasizing basic skills (26 percent). Other frequently reported goals for the adult facilities are providing GED preparation (12 percent) and job placement (11 percent). Principals at the youth facilities cited evaluation of educational and vocational potential (21 percent), helping youth select attainable goals (17 percent), helping children meet basic needs (16 percent), and creating a safe and success-oriented environment (14 percent). Thus, although programs at both types of facilities focus primarily on educational attainment and basic skills improvement, the education program at many youth facilities seems to have the improvement of student attitudes as a secondary goal, whereas programs in adult facilities aim more toward equipping students with prerequisites for the world of work.

Seventy percent of these correctional education programs are accredited by their state departments of education, while one-fourth of all participating facilities have had their programs accredited by the Commission on Accreditation for Corrections. The adult institutions are more likely to be accredited by a vocational association (34 percent versus 20 percent of the youth facilities), or by one of the regional commissions of colleges and schools (46 percent versus 8 percent). These figures reflect the more important role that vocational education and postsecondary education have in the education program at adult institutions.

The remainder of this chapter, discusses how facility education programs pursue their goals. Separate sections are devoted to examining the financial and personnel resources used to support education; the types of programs offered and numbers served; student selection, class assignment, and the use of incentives; and student evaluation and achievement. Key differences between youth and adult facilities are highlighted in each of these areas.

Budget and Staffing. A good measure of the priority granted to education, vis- -vis a facility's primary functions of confinement and maintaining security, is the proportion of the facility's overall budget allocated to education programs. Table 3-1 indicates how this measure differs by facility type.

Table 3-1. Education Allocation as a Percent of Total Facility Budget

	Total Facility Budget	Allocation for Education	Percent of Total Budget
Youth facilities (n = 198)	$906,472,692	$133,879,974	15
Adult facilities (n = 114)	$2,150,190,482	$104,851,334	5
Total (n = 312)	$3,056,663,174	$238,731,308	8

In the aggregate, the proportion of available resources spent on education in the youth facilities is three times the proportion in the adult institutions.

On average, each youth facility spends approximately $737,760 on education, compared with $919,000 in each adult institution. Because the typical adult facility has about three times as many students, however, more than per-pupil expenditure is much lower there than in youth facilities. In fact, the youth facilities spend more than twice as much per pupil ($5,591) as the adult facilities do ($2,422). Both figures, however, overestimate the actual expenditure per individual, as discussed later.

The figures just cited, primarily for comparative purposes, are based on total education expenditures for fiscal 1988 and the total number of regular education program participants as of 1 day during the year. An alternative figure would be based on the number of students served over the course of the entire year, which, because of student turnover, would be substantially higher than the number served on a single day. The net effect of this equation would be to reduce the expenditure figures per pupil in both types of facilities from the figures cited above. Although the number of inmates participating in education throughout the course of the year is not available from study respondents, the National Institute of Corrections has estimated that the average per pupil cost of providing correctional education for adult offenders in 1983 was $1,579 per student (Ryan, 1987, p. 20).

At both types of institutions, program administrators typically perceive a lack of sufficient funds as a significant obstacle to their programs. More than two-thirds of the school

principals, including 70 percent of those at youth facilities, report inadequate funding to be a problem in meeting students' educational needs, and increased funding is their most frequent recommendation for the overall improvement of correctional education.

Although the level of education spending varies greatly by institution type, there is little difference in how education funds are allocated. The adult facilities spend about 5 percent more of their total allocation on instructional materials and 5 percent less on staff salaries. However, in both types of institutions, staff compensation and instructional materials account for approximately 97 percent of total education allocations, with the remainder absorbed by staff training and computer-related expenses.

The distribution of staff resources also mirrors institutional priorities. That rehabilitation in general is more important in youth institutions is reflected in Table 3-2, which displays staff allocations, by facility type, among the three broad institutional functions: custody (guards), treatment (teachers, counselors, health professionals), and administration.

As these data clearly indicate, rehabilitation efforts, or treatment services, consume a much greater proportion of staff resources in youth facilities, while adult facilities direct more of their total staff to custodial concerns. About one-third of the difference in treatment staff is accounted for by education personnel.

Not surprisingly, staff allocation patterns closely follow expenditures, with 8 percent of all facility staff having education as their primary responsibility. In the youth facilities, 13 percent of all staff have education-related responsibilities, compared with just 6 percent in the adult prisons.

The two types of facilities do not vary much in the way they allocate education staff by function (Table 3-3). One exception is in the area of paid educational aides, who represent 11 percent of education staff in the youth facilities and just 2 percent in the adult institutions.[2]

---

[2] The number of full-time-equivalent education positions is very close to the total number of staff persons, in all categories, suggesting that nearly all education staff are full-time employees. Although some study respondents cited the use of part-time staff as a problem with the education program, these data suggest that the problem may be unique to only a few, probably smaller, institutions.

Table 3-2. Overall Staff Allocation, by Type of Facility

Staff	(n = 222) Youth Facility	%	(n = 133) Adult Facility	%	(n = 355) Total	%
Custodial/security	14,615	44	40,852	69	55,467	60
Treatment	12,638	38	9,168	16	21,806	24
Administration/ clerical	4,009	12	7,299	12	11,308	12
Other	1,653	5	1,756	3	3,408	4
Total	32,915	99%	59,075	100%	91,989	100%

Table 3-3. Allocation of Education Staff, by Type of Facility

Staff	(n = 222) Youth Facility	%	(n = 133) Adult Facility	%	(n = 355) Total	%
Teachers	3,071	71	2,560	75	5,631	73
Administrators	315	7	259	8	573	7
Paid aides	458	11	61	2	519	7
Counselors	133	3	96	3	228	3
Specialists	60	1	39	1	98	1
Other educational staff	294	7	401	12	696	9

The youth facilities, in addition to using aides more frequently, have much lower teacher caseloads. They have approximately one teacher for every 8 students, compared with one teacher for every 21 students in the adult facilities. The disparity in teacher caseloads, in combination with the greater use of instructional aides, is another indication that youth facilities

place a greater premium on the education and rehabilitation function and provide more individualized attention in education programs.

Programs Offered. Most correctional facilities offer a wide variety of education programs to their residents. As would be expected, however, the availability of certain programs varies by type of facility (Table 3-4). For example, the youth facilities are more likely to provide high school level classes and basic skills instruction, while much higher percentages of the adult institutions offer adult basic education and postsecondary instruction.

Table 3-4. Education Programs Offered, by Type of Facility

Program	Percent of Facilities Offering Subject		
	Youth Facility (n = 222)	Adult Facility (n = 140)	Total (n = 362)
Vocational education	70	96	80
General equivalency diploma (GED) preparation	68	86	76
Basic skills education	82	62	74
Special education instruction	74	66	71
Classes similar to high school classes	87	31	66
Adult basic education	8	96	42
Postsecondary instruction	18	74	40

Vocational education is the program most widely offered overall; it is available at 80 percent of all the facilities and at 96 percent of the adult institutions. Programs designed to prepare students to obtain the GED certificate also are available at most of the facilities. The availability of these two programs underscores a pragmatic approach to education in the corrections environment, particularly at adult institutions--an approach aimed at equipping residents with the functional skills needed to reenter society successfully.

A pragmatic orientation is also evident in the prevalence of computer-assisted instruction (CAI) in institutional education programs. CAI is particularly common in the adult institutions, where a majority of school principals indicated they use it in all program areas. The importance of computers is signaled by the 65 percent of program administrators who indicated that a lack of computer hardware and software currently presents problems in addressing student needs. Also, increased computer availability is the fourth most frequent recommendation of school principals for improving correctional education.

Numbers Served. On a given day in 1988 the state-operated correctional facilities participating in Chapter 1 N or D had approximately 79,000 students in the regular education program; about two-thirds of these were in adult institutions. On average, there were 120 students per youth facility and 390 per adult facility. Although inmates of adult institutions represent the majority of persons served in many program areas, youth facilities have a higher rate of inmate participation in most programs.

Vocational education programs served the largest number of students overall, with more than 32,000 participants, nearly two-thirds of whom were in adult facilities. Classes similar to those offered by high schools were the most heavily attended program in the youth facilities, followed closely by basic skills and vocational education programs. Table 3-5 provides the total and average number of program participants by type of facility.

Participation in special education programs is quite heavy, particularly in the youth facilities. About two-and-one-half times as many students in the youth facilities receive special-education instruction as receive GED preparation. This fact highlights the prevalence of with special needs youth within juvenile facilities and the associated challenges posed to the educational program at such institutions. School principals report that, on average, 31 percent of their students have learning disabilities, 24 percent are emotionally disturbed, 9 percent are mentally retarded, and 2 percent have physical disabilities. These percentages vary little by facility type, with the exception of emotionally disturbed and mentally ill students. Principals at the youth facilities estimate that up to 30 percent of all students are emotionally disturbed or mentally ill, compared with an estimated 13 percent of students at the adult institutions.

Table 3-5. Numbers of Students Receiving Various Regular Education Services, October 15, 1988, by Type of Facility

Regular Education Service	Number of Students Served					
	Youth Facility		Adult Facility		Total	
	Total	Average[a]	Total	Average	Total	Average
Vocational education (n = 286)	12,121	80	20,047	148	32,168	112
Adult basic education (n = 153)	755	43	15,307	113	16,602	105
Basic skills education (n = 260)	14,605	83	7,800	93	22,405	86
High school-level classes (n = 233)	15,579	82	3,838	88	19,417	84
Postsecondary instruction (n = 139)	536	15	9,429	91	9,965	72
General equivalency diploma (GED) preparation (n = 274)	2,532	17	8,847	73	11,379	42
Special education instruction (n = 250)	6,488	41	2,570	28	9,058	36

[a] For facilities offering area of instruction.

The amount of instruction scheduled by institutions varies little by program area or type of facility. Generally, all education programs except postsecondary instruction are offered between 20 and 25 hours a week for 46 to 48 weeks a year. Postsecondary education averages 14 hours per week for 41 weeks of the year. The youth facilities, on average, provide about one-third less GED preparation and vocational education instruction per week than do the adult institutions.

Student Selection. Student selection for participation in the education program is not an issue at most of the youth facilities because 98 percent of these institutions mandate participation for those under the state's compulsory attendance age. Because many inmates in the youth facilities are under this age, all inmates participate in the education program at 84 percent

such facilities.[3] Overall, 87 percent of the inmates of youth facilities participate in an education program.

Although certain states have recently instituted mandatory education programs for low achieving inmates, only 30 percent of the adult facilities require participation for inmates under the compulsory attendance age, and all facility inmates participate in the education program at just 7 percent of the adult facilities. Overall, only 33 percent of inmates in the adult institutions participate in education programs.

Test scores are used to select students at 54 percent of the adult institutions and teacher recommendations at 42 percent. Some 73 percent of the adult facilities report that all willing inmates participate in the education program.

Given the significance of student willingness, the use of incentives for resident participation in education programs becomes an important issue at most adult institutions. As Table 3-6 indicates, use of incentives is also common among the youth facilities.

The incentives most often used in both types of facilities are a certificate of completion and access to other facility programs, but both incentives are much more common for the adult facilities. The effectiveness of payment for attendance in the education program, offered by nearly half of the adult facilities, is probably somewhat dependent on the amount paid. If inmates can earn more by working in prison industry programs, and scheduling precludes participation in both work and education programs, it is logical to assume that the effectiveness of this incentive is somewhat diminished. A few adult institutions visited by study staff avoid this issue by offering job placement within the institution as an incentive for participation in, or completion of, education programs.

---

[3] Participation is required for those over the compulsory age at 83 percent of the youth facilities and 36 percent of the adult facilities.

Table 3-6. Incentives Used to Encourage Participation in Regular Education Program, by Type of Facility

Incentive	Percent of Facilities Offering Incentive[a]		
	Youth Facility (n = 222)	Adult Facility (n = 140)	Total (n = 362)
Certificate of completion	53	94	69
Access to other programs	36	81	53
Credit toward early release	27	56	38
Payment for attendance	9	47	24
Field trips	33	4	22
Other	47	15	35

[a] Columns do not add to 100 percent because more than one response was appropriate.

Other incentives provided by youth facilities include school credits and generally improved status in the school or facility. In one youth facility we visited, performance of individual students is rewarde l by increased responsibility at the school, such as serving as an aide to the principal. As other students observe the freedoms enjoyed by the student aide, such as unrestricted movement within and between buildings, it is hoped they, too, will work harder for improved status.

Student assignment to individual classes is determined primarily by achievement or grade level at both types of institutions. Other factors influencing students' class assignments, with roughly equal importance, include scheduling concerns, student interest, and student age.

Student Evaluation. Achievement tests are used primarily to assess student needs at entry into a facility and to evaluate improvement resulting from participation in education services. As Table 3-7 indicates, most of the facilities receive test scores from other sources, such as a central intake facility, as part of the incoming records for entering youth. Consistent with the different types of persons served by each type of institution, the youth facilities are more likely to

receive test information from public schools, whereas the adult facilities obtain achievement test results more often from other facilities.

Table 3-7. Sources of Achievement Test Scores for Entering Students, by Type of Facility

	Percent Receiving Test Scores		
	Youth Facility (n = 204)	Adult Facility (n = 130)	Total (n = 334)
Total receiving test scores from other sources	68	84	74
Public schools[a]	88	63	77
Central intake center	63	84	72
Other facilities	51	90	68

SOURCE: Education Program Administrator Interview.

[a] Percentage of those facilities that receive scores from other sources.

Irrespective of test information obtained from other sources, 89 percent of the facilities administer their own achievement tests to all residents under 21 years of age without a high school diploma at entry into the education program. Although testing of these Chapter 1-eligible residents upon entry is fairly routine regardless of facility type, the overall frequency of achievement testing does vary by type of institution, as shown in Table 3-8.

Forty-five percent of the youth facilities test student achievement only upon entry and exit from the facility, whereas 69 percent of the adult facilities test at regular intervals. Students at many youth facilities are there for only a few months, so testing at regular intervals is not meaningful. That testing varies by individual student at 14 percent of all the facilities also reflects the influence of student turnover.

Table 3-8. Frequency of Student Achievement Testing, by Type of Facility

Frequency	Percent Receiving Test Scores		
	Youth Facility (n = 222)	Adult Facility (n = 140)	Total (n = 362)
Never	0	0	0
Only upon entry	9	0	6
At entry and exit from facility	45	14	33
At entry and at regular intervals	34	69	47
Varies by student	12	17	14
Total	100%	100%	100%

According to data reported by school principals, the youth facilities are about three times as likely as adult facilities to administer achievement tests immediately before a student leaves the facility, probably because greater proportion of students leaving youth facilities return to the public schools.

When asked how achievement test scores are used, at least 80 percent of the principals in both types of facilities said they are used to inform teachers of student ability, to assign students to remedial services such as Chapter 1 and other classes, and to report to a state agency. In addition, 95 percent of the principals at youth facilities also say they use test scores to inform staff at schools that released youth will be attending, compared with one-third of the principals at adult facilities.

Support Services

Education is only one component of the rehabilitation efforts at most correctional facilities. Typically, facilities provide a number of other services designed to help inmates overcome various obstacles to learning and effective functioning (Table 3-9). As the table shows,

most of these support services are provided at both types of facilities, although the adult facilities are somewhat more likely to provide vocationally related support services, such as occupational skill training and job placement.

Table 3-9. Support Services Offered, by Type of Facility

Service	Percent of Facilities Offering Service		
	Youth Facility (n = 222)	Adult Facility (n = 140)	Total (n = 362)
Counseling	91	84	88
Job readiness/preemployment	87	81	84
Life skills training	83	81	82
Occupational skill training	77	84	80
Alcohol/drug abuse services	85	71	80
Health education	82	68	77
Computer literacy	68	74	71
Job placement	56	66	60
Training for parenthood	52	38	46

Counseling is the support service that students most often receive in both types of facilities. In the adult institutions, the services received next, most frequently, are life skills training, occupational skills training, preemployment training, and computer literacy instruction. In the youth facilities, the services received next, most frequently, are preemployment training, alcohol and drug abuse prevention training, and health education.

In addition to the services just discussed are those known as transitional services, so named because their intent is to facilitate student transition into the community, whether as a student in the public schools or as a full-time employee. Transitional services may take the form of special counseling to students just prior to their release, or interactions between the facility and community organizations, such as schools or employers, on behalf of soon-to-be-released inmates.

According to school principals, prerelease counseling in substance abuse, family relations, life skills, and employment is available in nearly all the facilities. Less frequently available is prerelease counseling in parenthood, victim impact, college financial aid, goal setting, and legal assistance.

Unlike prerelease counseling, availability of transitional services involving community organizations does vary by type of facility, as shown in Table 3-10. Transitional services designed to help students secure employment upon their release are somewhat more likely to be provided by the adult facilities, whereas youth facilities more frequently help released students secure housing and register at local schools. Other types of transitional services provided by facilities include homebound instruction and tax credits to employers.

Table 3-10. Selected Transitional Services Offered by Facilities, by Type of Facility

Service	Percent of Facilities Offering Service[a]		
	Youth Facility (n = 222)	Adult Facility (n = 140)	Total (n = 362)
Identification of employment opportunities	74	86	79
Help in registering at local public schools	66	28	51
Assignment to supervised residences	60	21	45
Other	22	10	18

[a] Columns do not add to 100 percent because as more than one response was appropriate.

Summary

Foremost among a number of formidable challenges facing the field of correctional education is the fact that education is not the primary function of corrections systems. School principals give evidence of education's low priority in the correctional environment by their recommendations: more funding (27 percent), greater teacher and administrator commitment (17 percent), more programs (16 percent), more classroom space (15 percent), and more computers

(15 percent). The relatively low priority given to education in institutions is a problem shared by many state-operated facilities housing school-age residents, but the problem appears particularly critical at adult institutions. Students are the minority at many such institutions, and proportionately fewer financial and personnel resources are allocated to support educational activities.

An equally difficult challenge encountered in correctional education is the fact that students in state-operated institutions are among the nation's most economically and educationally disadvantaged. With a preponderance of the students coming from single-parent families in poverty and having a history of failure in education, student attitudes are less than conducive to gains in achievement. In fact, 80 percent of all the school principals identified low student motivation as a problem in their attempt to address students' educational needs.

Education programs in youth and adult institutions, although similar in many respects, reflect somewhat different approaches to dealing with these challenges. In most juvenile facilities, participation in education is mandatory. Perhaps because their students are younger and, on average, remain in the institution for a shorter time, youth facilities tend to focus on improving student attitudes and basic skills. In adult facilities, education has a lower priority, use of incentives for inmate participation is more common, and available programs are somewhat more oriented toward preparing students for eventual employment.

Differences in the goals of education programs in the two types of facilities also seem to be reflected in the availability of certain types of education and support services and in the numbers of students receiving these services. Vocational education is the most widely attended program in the adult institutions, while high school classes and basic skills instruction attract the most students in the youth facilities. But vocational counseling and training are also an important part of the education program in many of the youth facilities, while student attitudes and academic advancement are obviously a concern in the adult facilities. The central issue for education in each type of facility is the overall importance of the program within the larger facility's mission and operations. The priority assigned to education may well determine its success, regardless of whether the emphasis is on attitudinal and behavioral improvement or vocational preparation.

4. CHAPTER 1 N OR D PROGRAM OPERATIONS

Chapter 1 N or D funds provide one-tenth of the total amount of money that participating correctional facilities use to support education programs. Because education allocations average 8 percent of a facility's overall budget, Chapter 1 provides less than 1 percent of the financial resources of a typical facility. Thus Chapter 1's role in the correctional environment is limited.

This is not to say Chapter 1 is an unimportant part of the total education program at many facilities, or that it has no influence on the progress of particular individuals. The point is that the program's scope and results are constrained by the scale of the contribution and by the varying institutional contexts for program services.

Locus of the Program

The Chapter 1 N or D program operates within three types of state-operated institutions: facilities for neglected youth, juvenile delinquent facilities, and adult correctional institutions. Of all facilities under the jurisdiction of Chapter 1 N or D state applicant agencies (SAAs), facilities for neglected youth account for 2 percent, juvenile delinquent facilities 37 percent, and adult correctional institutions the remaining 61 percent.

Nearly all facilities for neglected youth under the jurisdiction of participating SAAs (91 percent) receive Chapter 1 funding, but because there are relatively few such facilities and because they are relatively small, they house only a small fraction of the total institutionalized population eligible for Chapter 1 services. Adult facilities, while representing the majority of state-operated correctional institutions, are far less likely to operate a Chapter 1 program, with only about one-fourth receiving Chapter 1 funds.* Thus the bulk of the Chapter 1 N or D services are provided in juvenile delinquent facilities, 59 percent of which participate. Table 4-1 provides three different measures of Chapter 1 N or D program concentration by type of facility. It shows that juvenile facilities account for 55 percent of all facilities that receive Chapter 1 N or D funding, 60 percent

---

* Reasons why eligible facilities do not receive Chapter 1 funding are explored in detail in Chapter 6 on program administration.

of all Chapter 1-eligible students, and 67 percent of all Chapter 1 N or D participants. Juvenile facilities also have larger programs, on average (Table 4-2).

Table 4-1. Locus of Chapter 1 N or D Program, by Type of Facility

	Neglected Youth Facility	Youth Facility	Adult Facility	Total (percent)
Percent of all facilities with a Chapter 1 program[a] (N = 74)	5	55	40	100
Percent of all Chapter 1--eligible students, October 15, 1988 (N = 67)	4	60	37	100
Percent of all Chapter 1 participants, October 15, 1988 (N = 69)	5	67	28	100

SOURCE: Mail Survey of SAAs.

[a] Rows may not add to 100 because of rounding.

Thus, youth correctional facilities are much more likely than adult institutions to participate in the Chapter 1 N or D program, to house a majority of all residents eligible for and served by Chapter 1 N or D, and to have more participants per facility than either of the other types of facility. In general, youth facilities place a higher priority on education than adult facilities do.

Table 4-2. Average Size of Chapter 1 N or D Program, by Type of Facility

	Neglected Youth Facility (N = 74)	Youth Facility (N = 73)	Adult Facility (N = 68)
Average number of Chapter 1--eligible students	98	143	119
Average number of Chapter 1 students	62	81	43

SOURCE: Mail Survey of SAAs.

Levels of Student Participation

Overall, roughly half of all eligible students in participating facilities receive Chapter 1 N or D services - about the same percentage of eligible students as in 1976. As was also the case then, this percentage varies considerably by type of facility. In facilities for neglected youth nearly two-thirds of all eligible students are served, in youth institutions more than half are served, and in adult facilities somewhat more than one-third of eligible students receive services. Table 4-3 indicates the proportions of all eligible students served by the program, by type of participating facility, for 1976 and 1988.* As shown, participation in facilities for neglected youth has dropped 6 percent and participation in juvenile facilities 9 percent, while adult facilities show a 4 percent increase. Overall, however, there are still approximately as many eligible inmates of correctional institutions not receiving Chapter 1 N or D services as being served.

In examining the question of why more eligible students are not receiving Chapter 1 N or D services, two very different issues emerge. Reasons underlying levels of participation in the Chapter 1 program clearly differ in importance by type of facility (Table 4-4). In the youth institutions, where a high percentage of eligible residents already participate in the Chapter 1

* The figures presented here, based on data from SAAs, provide an overview of the Chapter 1 N or D program across all three types of participating facilities. Data obtained in the survey of participating correctional facilities are slightly different, showing that 59 percent of federally eligible students in youth facilities and 36 percent in adult facilities are served. In other sections of the report, concerned with delinquent youth and adult correctional facilities, we use the data obtained from facilities, because not all SAAs responded to the survey, not all responding SAAs provided usable data for this data element, and facility data have the advantage of being weighted to provide national estimates.

program, still greater numbers would be served if additional resources were available. Moreover, in those youth facilities where participation is restricted by scheduling concerns, it is other educational activities, rather than work, that more frequently take precedence over Chapter 1.

Table 4-3. Chapter 1 N or D Students as a Percentage of all Chapter 1 - Eligible Residents, by Type of Facility, 1976 and 1988

Type of Facility	Percent of all Chapter 1-Eligible Residents Served	
	1976	1988
Neglected youth facilities	72	66
Youth facilities	65	56
Adult facilities	34	38
Total (average)	52%	50%

SOURCES: Compensatory Education and Confined Youth, Vol. I, September 1977, p. 43; and Mail Survey of SAAs.

In participating adult institutions, a much different set of conditions explain why only 38 percent of these eligible population receive Chapter 1 N or D services. Student behavioral problems, student refusal of services, and scheduling conflicts with work activities are the three most frequently cited reasons. Each of these factors reflects the greater role that student choice has in education programs within adult institutions, and the relatively low priority that the education occupies in the institution.

Table 4-4. Reasons Why Not All Eligible Students Are Served, by Type of Facility

Reason	Percent Giving the Reason[a]		
	Youth Facility (n = 114)	Adult Facility (n = 62)	Total Facility (n = 176)
Student refusal of service	26	68	40
Lack of room to serve all eligible	62	13	43
Lack of resources to serve all eligible	50	6	33
Schedule conflicts with work schedule	13	58	31
Student behavioral problems	7	68	28
Schedule conflicts with other education activities	26	15	22

SOURCE: Chapter 1 Coordinator Interview.

[a] Columns do not add to 100 percent because more than one response was appropriate.

Facilities often use scores on standardized achievement tests in selecting Chapter 1 N or D program participants. About three-fourths of all participating facilities do so, including 90 percent of youth facilities. The remaining 10 percent of youth facilities provide Chapter 1 services to all students in the regular education program. Among adult institutions, 54 percent report using test scores. This difference between the two types of institutions arises because most youth facilities have a larger proportion of potentially eligible students from whom to select Chapter 1 participants.*

Defining the eligible population is one of the administrative functions of the Chapter 1 program that becomes more problematic within the corrections environment. In many institutions virtually all inmates are educationally and economically disadvantaged. In most youth

* Tests used to select Chapter 1 participants also vary considerably by type of facility. Four-fifths of the adult institutions that rely on test scores use the Test of Adult Basic Achievement (TABE) either alone or in conjunction with another test. In youth facilities the tests used most frequently include the TABE (29 percent), the Wide Range Achievement Test (22 percent), and the Woodcock-Johnson Psycho-Educational Battery (18 percent).

facilities, all inmates also meet the age requirement for eligibility. Thus test results may be the only way to identify the most needy.

From an adult facility's perspective, however, the most salient issue regarding program participation is not why more eligible inmates are not served, but why more inmates are not eligible. The most frequent recommendation that Chapter 1 coordinators in adult facilities offer for improving the N or D program is to raise or eliminate the age limit for eligibility. In a prison, the age limit prevents a majority of the population in need of remedial education from receiving Chapter 1 services. In fact, from a facility perspective, older inmates may often be better students, because, in most states they elect to receive services. Moreover, their age--21 years of age or older--only increases the urgency for help.

Chapter 1 N or D Resource Allocations

The Chapter 1 N or D program assumes a more substantial role in the overall education program in those institutions that confine only school-age persons. In the youth facilities, the program represents 14 percent of the total education budget compared with 5 percent in the adult institutions. The youth facilities received an average, $94,000 each from Chapter 1 N or D in fiscal 1988 (and averaged total education budgets of $738,000), while the adult facilities received, on average, $46,000 (and averaged education budgets of $919,000).

Based on the number of Chapter 1 N or D students as of October 18, 1988, the amount of Chapter 1 N or D funding, expended annually per pupil at youth facilities, averaged $1,500, compared with $1,300 at adult institutions. Because of student turnover during the year, however, the amount expended per individual student is much lower. Data obtained from 51 SAAs that could identify the total number of Chapter 1 N or D students over the course of an entire year indicate that per pupil expenditure of Chapter 1 N or D funds amounted to $628 across all institutions.*

---

* The 1977 study of the Chapter 1 N or D program found per student expenditures of $433 in youth facilities and $474 in adult institutions (Bartell et al., 1977, p. 128)

The important point here is that, although adult facilities receive, on average, a Chapter 1 N or D allocation that is 51 percent less than that received by youth facilities, the actual amount expended per person is only 15 percent less. Moreover, when examined as a percent of the total per-pupil expenditure, the contribution made by Chapter 1 N or D is actually much higher in adult facilities.

In the previous chapter we estimated the total education expenditure per pupil to be approximately $5,600 in youth facilities and about $2,400 in adult facilities. When the Chapter 1 N or D per pupil expenditures of $1,500 and $1,300 are analyzed as a percent of these total amounts expended per pupil, we find that Chapter 1 accounts for 25 percent of the total per-pupil expenditure in youth facilities, compared with 54 percent in adult facilities. Moreover, the relationship between the percent of total per pupil spending is independent of student turnover, because total expenditures and Chapter 1 expenditures are reduced in equal proportion as a result of turnover. Hence, although Chapter 1 N or D assumes a more substantial role in the overall education program at youth facilities, because a greater number of youth facilities' inmates are served, the contribution of Chapter 1 N or D to the total amount spent on the education of Chapter 1 N or D participants is twice as great in adult facilities as in youth facilities.

Chapter 1 N or D funds are distributed in much the same way as other education funding, with 90 percent spent on staff salaries, 3 percent on instructional materials, 4 percent on computer hardware and software, 1 percent on staff training, and the remaining 2 percent on various other education-related expenses. In comparison with overall education spending, a slightly higher proportion of Chapter 1 N or D funds (4 percent compared with 1 percent) is used to purchase computers and software, and less is allocated to instructional materials (1 percent compared with 4 percent).

Yet, while representing about one-tenth of overall education expenditures, Chapter 1 N or D accounts for about 21 percent of total staff training expenses and 43 percent of computer-related allocations. Table 4-5 indicates the percent of total spending represented by Chapter 1 in each area of expenditure.

Table 4-5. Chapter 1 N or D Expenditures as a Percent of Total Education Expenditures, by Category of Expenditure

Expenditure	Amount of Total Education Expenditures (n = 338)	Amount of Chapter 1 N or D Expenditures (n = 338)	Chapter 1 as a Percent of Total Education Expenditures (n = 338)
Staff salaries and benefits	$248,836,809	$22,221,362	9
Instructional materials	16,698,968	853,007	5
Computer hardware and software	1,963,487	848,614	43
Training and development	1,038,478	212,906	21
Other expenses	4,604,707	486,912	11
Total	$273,142,449	$24,622,801	9%[a]

SOURCE: Mail Survey of Facilities.

[a] The 10 percent figure reported earlier was based on a larger number of cases; not all respondents furnished expenditure information by category.

Reliance on Chapter 1 N or D funds for computer purchases is particularly high in adult facilities, where Chapter 1 provides 47 percent of the amount used for such purchases. According to 14 percent of program coordinators at adult facilities, providing computer-assisted instruction (CAI) is an important contribution of Chapter 1 to the overall education program. While purchases of computers and software represent just 4 percent of all Chapter 1 N or D expenditures in those adult facilities, CAI is among the most frequently mentioned specific function of the Chapter 1 N or D program, after the expected, more general, response of providing supplemental instruction.

Chapter 1 N or D also supports a high proportion of staff training and development, particularly at youth facilities, where 27 percent of all such expenditures come from Chapter 1 N or D funds. Data obtained from Chapter 1 and regular classroom teachers regarding the relative amount of in-service training received over the past 3 years also show that Chapter 1 N or D funds

amount of in-service training received over the past 3 years also show that Chapter 1 N or D funds provide relatively more staff training than regular education funds. Chapter 1 N or D teachers at youth facilities report an average of 71 hours of training, compared with 49 hours for other teachers at such facilities. The importance of Chapter 1-funded in-service training is further indicated by Chapter 1 coordinators, 10 percent of whom identified in-service training passed on to regular teachers as one of the roles of Chapter 1 N or D in the facility's overall education program.

The disproportionately high level of expenditure of Chapter 1 N or D funds on computer-related products and staff training might be explained by several factors. One possible explanation is that program managers first put the Chapter 1 dollars into salaries for their staff, and then use any additional amount that is not enough to support another full-time-equivalent position for one-time expenditures such as computers or an inservice workshop. Furthermore, because computers and workshops are easily identifiable as Chapter 1 purchases, they provide a conveniently simple audit trail for the program.

In addition to providing resources for computers and in-service training, Chapter 1 N or D is also particularly important as a source of funding for classroom aides. Of the approximately 900 Chapter 1-funded staff persons in participating facilities, about 240 are paid education aides. Although just 12 percent of total education staff are funded by Chapter 1, 47 percent of all instructional aides are funded by Chapter 1. Reliance on the Chapter 1 N or D grant to provide classroom aides is particularly great in adult institutions, where 57 percent of all such staff are Chapter 1--funded positions. Twenty-two percent of program administrators in adult facilities reported providing aides as a role of the Chapter 1 N or D program--the highest percent citing any specific function.

There are still relatively few classroom aides in adult institutions. Table 4-6 presents the total and average numbers of Chapter N or D 1 staff persons, by area of responsibility, in each type of participating facility. Youth facilities average three Chapter 1 staff persons--usually either one or two full-time Chapter 1 teachers and one classroom aide. In adult facilities, where the number of participating students averages about half that found in youth institutions, there are fewer than two full-time Chapter 1 staff persons, including just one teacher, on average. As is the case with the regular education program, the use of paid aides in the Chapter 1 classroom is more common in juvenile facilities than in adult institutions.

Table 4-6. Number of Chapter 1 N or D Staff Persons, by Type of Facility

Responsibility	Youth Facility (n = 222) Total	Youth Facility (n = 222) Average	Adult Facility (n = 140) Total	Adult Facility (n = 140) Average	Total (n = 362) Total	Total (n = 362) Average
Teachers	383	1.7	184	1.3	567	1.6
Paid aides	208	0.9	35	0.2	243	0.6
Other educational staff	67	0.3	17	0.1	84	0.2
Total	658	2.9	236	1.6	894	2.4

SOURCE: Mail Survey of Facilities.

Youth facilities average about twice as many Chapter 1-funded staff persons and Chapter 1 students per facility as adult facilities do. Thus, typical Chapter 1 teacher caseloads (the number of Chapter 1 students served by each teacher per day), are only slightly higher in youth facilities (Table 4-7). When Chapter 1 aides are taken into account, the total number of students served per instructional staff member per day is the same for both types of facilities--an average of 23 Chapter 1 students are served per Chapter 1 staff member. Also, as Table 4-7 shows, based on the average number of classes taught per day by Chapter 1 teachers, a student-teacher ratio of 7 students per Chapter 1 teacher prevails for each type of facility. Thus, regardless of the type of facility, there are an average of 23 students per Chapter 1 staff person and a student-teacher ratio of 7:1 in the typical Chapter 1 class.

Table 4-7. Chapter 1 N or D Student-Staff Ratios, by Type of Facility

	Youth Facility (n = 222)	Adult Facility (n = 140)	Total (n = 362)
Total number of Chapter 1 teachers	383	184	567
Total number of Chapter 1 students	13,514	5,074	18,588
Average teacher caseload	35	28	33
Average number of classes taught per day by Chapter 1 teachers	5	4	5
Student-teacher ratio in typical Chapter 1 class	7:1	7:1	7:1

SOURCES: Mail Survey of Facilities and Chapter 1 Teacher Interviews.

Chapter 1 N or D Services

As shown in Table 4-8, Chapter 1 N or D funding supports a wide range of academic and other services at correctional institutions. The three most widely available Chapter 1 N or D classes, regardless of type of facility, are reading, mathematics, and language arts. Other notable findings shown in this table are the frequency with which the adult facilities offer combined classes and the high proportions of facilities offering various nonacademic courses funded by Chapter 1.

Because adult facilities average 40 Chapter 1 students and 1.5 Chapter 1 instructors each, the use of a single class to provide instruction in all three subject areas is perhaps not so surprising. In many cases, the Chapter 1 teacher is also the student's only academic instructor. Hence, in many adult facilities, Chapter 1 is a means of providing for an additional teacher or for a portion of a teacher's salary, and in the classroom it is difficult to differentiate Chapter 1 from other instruction. In fact, 58 percent of all Chapter 1 teachers in adult facilities indicated that they provide all of the student's Chapter 1 instruction and that the Chapter 1 class is also the student's regular classroom, compared with only 20 percent of Chapter 1 teachers in youth facilities.

Table 4-8. Chapter 1 N or D Instruction Offered, by Type of Facility

Subject	Percent of Facilities		
	Youth Facility (n = 222)	Adult Facility (n = 140)	Total (n = 362)
Chapter 1 reading	86	74	81
Chapter 1 language arts	51	53	52
Chapter 1 mathematics	83	74	80
English as a second language (ESL)	3	19	9
Combined reading, language arts, and mathematics	17	49	29
Study skills	14	38	23
Counseling	17	43	27
Social or life skills	22	45	31
Transitional services	7	11	9
Other Chapter 1 instruction	11	6	8

SOURCE: Mail Survey of Facilities.

In contrast to Chapter 1, various other educational programs, such as GED preparation or vocational instruction, have more clearly identifiable goals, such as obtaining a GED or a certificate of competency or license. Instruction is therefore sequenced to facilitate accomplishing the goal, and individual progress is more easily measured through increasing mastery of a particular subject matter or skill area. By comparison, Chapter 1 is much less of a defined program in the traditional sense. Moreover, in many adult facilities, Chapter 1 is so small in comparison to other educational programs that it exists as a distinct entity only with respect to its sources of funding and its administrative requirements.

A review of the types of classes that program participants attend and the average number of hours per week spent in each type of class helps provide a picture of how Chapter 1 instruction fits into the overall course taking patterns of Chapter 1 students.

As seen in Table 4-9, a significant majority of Chapter 1 participants in youth facilities attend academic classes, while half receive instruction in vocational education and about one-fifth are enrolled in GED preparation classes.

Table 4-9. Classes Attended by Chapter 1 N or D Participants, by Type of Facility

Class	Percent of Chapter 1 Participants		
	Youth Facility	Adult Facility	Total
Academic instruction (n = 11,549)	90	50	80
Chapter 1 reading (n = 7,954)	53	61	55
Chapter 1 mathematics (n = 7,160)	51	46	50
Vocational instruction (n = 6,884)	50	40	48
GED preparation (n = 3,958)	21	50	28
Chapter 1 language arts (n = 2,383)	16	19	17
Adult basic education (n = 1,569)	4	34	11
Other Chapter 1 class (n = 1,488)	1	0	1

SOURCE: Student Questionnaire.

Chapter 1 participants in adult institutions are much less likely to receive academic instruction but much more likely to attend GED preparation classes--another indication of the more pragmatic orientation of education programs in adult institutions. The hours of academic and Chapter 1 instruction scheduled for participating students at both types of facilities are roughly equivalent. Somewhat surprisingly, a lower proportion of adult facility participants are engaged in vocational instruction; but, as Table 4-10 indicates, those who do attend such classes in adult institutions spend more time in them. Courses in GED preparation average 3 hours per week longer for participants in adult facilities than for those in youth facilities.

Table 4-10. Average Number of Hours Scheduled per Week for Chapter 1 N or D Participants, by Type of Class and Facility

Hours per Week	Youth Facility	Adult Facility
Academic classes	(n = 9,765)	(n = 688)
Mean	15.1	11.9
Median	15	15
GED preparation classes	(n = 887)	(n = 580)
Mean	4.5	8.3
Median	5	8
Vocational classes	(n = 5,031)	(n = 1,230)
Mean	10.0	15.8
Median	10	15
Chapter 1 reading classes	(n = 4,784)	(n = 1,600)
Mean	5.4	8.4
Median	5	5
Chapter 1 mathematics classes	(n = 6,003)	(n = 931)
Mean	4.9	6.0
Median	5	4

SOURCE: Student Record Abstract.

As mentioned earlier, many facilities use Chapter 1 N or D funding to provide nonacademic services such as counseling and life skills training. Education program administrators were asked to indicate whether certain resident services are available at their facilities and, if so, whether Chapter 1 funding is used to provide these services. About one-fourth of all facilities offering life skills training, regardless of type, report using Chapter 1 funding for this service.

Another nonacademic subject frequently supported with Chapter 1 N or D funds is computer literacy. One-fifth of the youth facilities offering such instruction rely, at least in part, on Chapter 1 funding to provide this service, while 31 percent of adult facilities with this service use Chapter 1 funds for it.

Summary

The role of the Chapter 1 N or D program, as reported by program administrators, is essentially the prescribed function: to provide supplemental instruction to low achieving students. Most of the funds (90 percent) support salaries and benefits, primarily for teachers. Compared with the funds from other sources that facilities spend on education, however, Chapter 1 is especially important in providing classroom aides, providing computers and computer-related instruction, supporting in-service training of instructional staff, and helping to provide life skills training.

The Chapter 1 N or D program is concentrated primarily in youth facilities, which, unlike adult facilities, have an organizational structure and mission resembling those of schools. The program in youth facilities, therefore, has a closer resemblance to the basic grant Chapter 1 program. Program operations in adult facilities are far more limited, by virtue of smaller numbers of participants, and have a somewhat different focus, in response to the needs and priorities of the inmates who participate.

In youth facilities, where education generally has a higher priority, Chapter 1 primarily supplements academic instruction. In adult facilities, program participants are just as likely to attend GED preparation instruction, and nearly as likely to attend vocational education classes, as they are to have academic instruction.

Although the role of the Chapter 1 N or D program may vary with larger institutional priorities, in some respects its contribution to total facility operations is small. In adult facilities particularly, the amount of money received is typically insufficient for program development in the traditional sense. Rather, funds may be used to compensate a single teacher, with any remaining amounts used for one-time expenses such as computer purchases or staff training. However, although total Chapter 1 N or D allocations to adult institutions are smaller than those to youth facilities, the contribution represented by Chapter 1 N or D to total per pupil expenditures on education is about twice as great in adult institutions.

In youth facilities, the recommendation most frequently offered by program coordinators for improving the Chapter 1 N or D program is to increase funding. This recommendation reflects a setting where education is mandatory, almost all facility residents need supplemental services, and present Chapter 1 resources are inadequate to meet that need. In adult facilities, the most common recommendation is to eliminate the age limit on eligibility for services, reflecting a lack of fit between the structure and purpose of the Chapter 1 N or D program and the nature and mission of adult correctional institutions.

5. CHARACTERISTICS OF TEACHERS AND INSTRUCTION*

This chapter describes characteristics of the teaching staff and instruction in Chapter 1 N or D and the regular education program in participating facilities. The topics discussed include teachers' education and professional experience; instructional characteristics such as teaching responsibilities, use of time, resource availability and use, instructional methods, and administrative leadership; and teachers' perceptions of effectiveness. Key findings of this chapter are as follows:

- Chapter 1 N or D and regular program teachers in correctional institutions are similar to the nation's teachers as a whole in education and years of experience.
- Three-fourths of Chapter 1 N or D instruction and more than one-half of regular instruction is via the individualized approach, in which students typically work alone on worksheets or packets of materials.
- Only 40 percent of the teachers provide any opportunity for instructional interaction among students, and the percentage is lowest in adult facilities.
- Seventy percent of Chapter 1 N or D teachers in youth facilities and 86 percent in adult facilities meet with administrators one or more times a year. Yet neither Chapter 1 nor regular program teachers meet with education program administrators monthly to discuss program plans and procedures and to identify program needs.
- Students in Chapter 1 N or D institutions are frequently absent from class because of structural or programmatic constraints. Hence, missed opportunities for learning is a key issue.

Professional Experience

The teachers in participating correctional facilities constitute a relatively stable teaching force, with only minor differences in experience between Chapter 1 N or D and regular teachers and between teachers in youth and adult facilities.

The typical Chapter 1 teacher in correctional settings has been teaching for almost 15 years, almost 8 years in noninstitutional settings and 7 years in their current correctional

---

* Unless otherwise noted, data presented in this chapter are from the teacher questionnaire.

facility. (See Table 5-1.) About 6 years of that experience are in Chapter 1 instruction, with 5 years in correctional facilities and almost 1 year in public or private school settings. The typical Chapter 1 teacher in an adult facility has about 1 additional year of Chapter 1 teaching experience in correctional institutions and almost 3 additional years of prior teaching experience in noncorrectional settings.

Regular education teachers in participating facilities average 14 years of teaching experience. Half of their teaching experience is in correctional settings. About 20 percent of regular education teachers have some familiarity with Chapter 1, having taught Chapter 1 for 1 year on average. Compared with regular education teachers in adult facilities, those in youth facilities have an additional year of teaching experience in correctional settings but 2 fewer years of experience in noncorrectional settings.

Both Chapter 1 and regular education teachers in participating facilities thus have an average level of experience comparable to that of the nation's teachers as a whole. According to current figures from the National Education Association (NEA, 1986), 45 percent of all teachers had from 3 to 14 years of full-time teaching experience, and 51 percent had 15 or more years of teaching experience.

In both youth and adult facilities, Chapter 1 teachers hold teaching certificates. About 5 percent of regular education teachers overall are not certified, including 7 percent of those in adult facilities. Of the relatively few teachers who are not certified to teach, 20 percent have no college degree, 51 percent have a college degree or certificate based on less than 4 years of college, and almost 30 percent have a bachelor's degree. About 60 percent of the noncertified teachers teach math and social studies, and 40 percent teach vocational education. Only about 8 percent of noncertified teachers teach reading, language arts, adult basic education, or GED preparation classes.

Overall, the instructional level at which teachers are certified is appropriate to the age and remedial needs of correctional students. Slightly over one-half of Chapter 1 teachers are certified in both elementary and secondary education, 27 percent only at the secondary level, and fewer than 20 percent only at the elementary level. Only 12 percent of regular teachers are certified at both elementary and secondary levels; 57 percent of regular teachers are certified only at the secondary level, while 24 percent hold only elementary teaching certificates. Seven percent

of Chapter 1 teachers and 9 percent of regular education teachers are not certified in their areas of instruction.

Table 5-1. Average Number of Years Experience for Chapter 1 N or D and Regular Program Teachers, by Type of Facility

	Average Number of Years		
Chapter 1	Youth Facility (n = 396)	Adult Facility (n = 171)	Total (average) (n = 567)
Teaching other than Chapter 1 in correctional institutions	1.2	1.2	1.2
Teaching Chapter 1 in correctional institutions	4.7	5.9	5.0
Teaching other than Chapter 1 in public or private school settings	6.8	9.8	7.7
Teaching Chapter 1 in public or private school settings	0.9	0.5	0.8
Nonteaching position in correctional setting	0.4	0.6	0.5
Regular	(n = 2,306)	(n = 1,241)	(n = 3,547)
Teaching other than Chapter 1 in correctional institutions	6.9	5.7	6.5
Teaching Chapter 1 in correctional institutions	0.9	0.9	0.9
Teaching other than Chapter 1 in public or private school settings	5.7	7.7	6.3
Teaching Chapter 1 in public or private school settings	0.2	0.0	0.2
Nonteaching position in correctional setting	1.2	0.8	1.0

The educational attainment of teachers in correctional facilities reflects the norm for teachers in the United States. According to the NEA (1986), 48 percent of all teachers held a bachelor's degree, while 51 percent of all teachers held either a master's degree or a 6-year

diploma. Thus 99 percent of all teachers have at least a bachelor's degree, which is the same percent found among Chapter 1 teachers in correctional facilities. Of these Chapter 1 teachers, 90 percent have had additional formal course work, exceeding the norm, while 37 percent have master's degrees or higher (Table 5-2). Almost half of Chapter 1 teachers in adult facilities have master's or doctoral degrees, compared with one-third of Chapter 1 teachers in youth facilities. Among regular teachers in participating facilities, 86 percent have bachelor's degrees and 28 percent have master's degrees or higher. Chapter 1 teachers in adult facilities tend to have higher levels of education than Chapter 1 teachers in youth facilities.

The teachers surveyed described their formal course work, in-service training, and work experience in terms of its relevance to the special learning needs of institutionalized youth (Table 5-3). Eighty percent of Chapter 1 teachers have had formal course work in remedial reading instruction, and about 40 percent have had formal course work in remedial mathematics. About 60 percent of Chapter 1 teachers have received in-service training in remedial reading, and slightly more than one-half have prior work experience in this area. The amount of formal course work, in-service training, and prior work in remedial math is consistently lower than in reading, probably because most Chapter 1 teachers teach reading, while only some teach math. Fewer regular education teachers have had formal in-service training or prior work experience in remedial reading or math instruction, but more than half reported coursework or in-service training in diagnosis of special learning problems.

In addition to prior formal education, course work, and work experience, correctional teachers receive in-service training opportunities. Virtually every Chapter 1 N or D teacher reported receiving in-service training. Overall, Chapter 1 teachers have received an average of almost 60 hours of in-service training related to instructional planning within the past 3 years. The range of opportunities varies from 2 to 185 hours. Chapter 1 teachers in youth facilities have received an average of 71 hours of in-service training--twice as much as teachers in adult facilities.

About 80 percent of regular education teachers receive in-service training opportunities. There are only slight differences in the proportions of regular education teachers in youth and adult facilities who have received in-service training. For those regular education teachers who have received in-service training, the average is the same as among Chapter 1 teachers--60 hours over the past 3 years.

Table 5-2. Highest Level of Education for Chapter 1 N or D and Regular Program Teachers, by Type of Facility

	Percent of Teachers		
Chapter 1	Youth Facility (n = 402)	Adult Facility (n = 171)	Total (average) (n = 573)
No college degree or certificate	1	0	1
Certificate or degree based on less than four years of college	0	0	0
Bachelor's degree	11	5	9
Beyond bachelor's degree but not a master's or Doctorate	55	46	53
Master's degree	11	13	11
Beyond master's degree but not a doctorate	22	28	24
Doctoral degree	0	8	2
Regular	(n = 2,429)	(n = 1,241)	(n = 3,670)
No college degree or certificate	1	3	2
Certificate or degree based on less than 4 years of college	10	15	12
Bachelor's degree	21	1	14
Beyond bachelor's degree but not a master's or Doctorate	37	58	44
Master's degree	11	11	11
Beyond master's degree but not a doctorate	17	11	15
Doctoral degree	2	1	2

Table 5-3. Areas of Formal Course Work or Experience for Chapter 1 N or D and Regular Program Teachers, by Type of Facility

	Percent of Teachers		
Chapter 1 (n=573)	Formal Course Work	In-service Training	Prior Work Experience
Remedial instruction in mathematics	38	46	43
Remedial instruction in reading	80	63	52
Diagnosis of special learning problems	69	59	41
Counseling or social work	39	44	27
Education in a correctional setting	15	75	24
Regular (n = 3,670)	Formal Course Work	Inservice Training	Prior Work Experience
Remedial instruction in mathematics	33	35	27
Remedial instruction in reading	46	44	32
Diagnosis of special learning problems	63	52	27
Counseling or social work	32	45	29
Education in a correctional setting	20	58	24

Other opportunities to improve teachers' instructional abilities are provided by their participation in college-level courses. Fifty-four percent of Chapter 1 N or D teachers and 61 percent of regular education teachers have had college-level courses related to instruction within the past 3 years. More Chapter 1 teachers in youth facilities (60 percent) reported they had taken such courses than in adult facilities (41 percent); they also participated in almost twice as many courses. More regular education teachers in youth facilities reported that they take courses than the teachers in adult facilities, but they participate in only half as many courses.

Finally, as a measure of professional satisfaction, teachers were asked their choice of workplace (Table 5-4). About 70 percent of Chapter 1 N or D and regular education teachers

indicated they would choose to continue to work in their current facility. About 20 percent indicated they would prefer to work in a noncorrectional environment, and about 10 percent indicated they would prefer to work in a context apart from education. One-third of the Chapter 1 teachers in adult facilities reported that they would prefer to teach in noncorrectional settings. Twenty percent of regular education teachers in adult facilities said they would prefer settings other than education or corrections entirely.

Table 5-4. Teacher's Choice of Workplace for Chapter 1 N or D and Regular Program Teachers, by Type of Facility

	Percent of Teachers		
Chapter 1	Youth Facility (n = 402)	Adult Facility (n = 171)	Total (average) (n = 573)
I would work in this facility	69	65	68
I would work in another correctional facility	0	0	0
I would work in a regular public school	13	20	15
I would work in a regular private school	5	13	7
Other	13	3	10
Regular	(n = 2,260)	(n = 1,209)	(n = 3,469)
I would work in this facility	72	68	70
I would work in another correctional facility	3	2	3
I would work in a regular public school	15	8	13
I would work in a regular private school	7	1	5
Other	4	20	9

Instructional Characteristics

Teachers provided descriptions of their work, including their teaching responsibilities, use of time, resource availability and utilization, instructional methods, and administrative leadership. The following sections describe each of these aspects of instruction in some detail.

Teaching Responsibilities and Use of Time. Virtually all teachers in correctional facilities are full-time employees. More than 50 percent of Chapter 1 teachers teach Chapter 1 reading and almost 40 percent teach mathematics; 35 percent teach Chapter 1 in a basic skills approach that combines reading/language arts and mathematics (Table 5-5). Because of the age and social history of residents of correctional institutions, almost one-third of Chapter 1 teachers provide Chapter 1 services in a social skills/life skills approach. The combined basic skills and the social/life skills approaches are more prevalent in adult facilities, where more than half the Chapter 1 teachers have teaching duties in each of these approaches. Subjects taught by regular teachers are shown in Table 5-6.

Table 5-5. Subjects Currently Taught by Chapter 1 N or D Teachers, by Type of Facility

Subject	Percent of Chapter 1 Teachers		
	Youth Facility (n = 396)	Adult Facility (n = 171)	Total (average) (n = 567)
Chapter 1 reading	53	56	54
Chapter 1 language arts	38	38	38
Chapter 1 math	41	35	39
Chapter 1 combined reading/language arts and math	26	55	35
Chapter 1 social skills/life skills	22	57	32

Table 5-6. Subjects Currently Taught by Regular Program Teachers, by Type of Facility

Subject	Percent of Regular Program Teachers		
	Youth (n=2429)	Adult (n=1241)	Total (n=3670)
Reading	20	53	31
Language arts	37	66	47
Math	40	52	44
Social studies	32	43	36
Science	20	29	23
Social skills/life skills	22	51	32
Adult basic education	5	53	21
English as second language	0	3	1
GED preparation	32	38	34
Vocational education	29	33	30
Postsecondary classes	3	0	2

Both Chapter 1 and regular teachers teach an average of almost five classes per day. Teachers in adult facilities teach slightly less than four classes per day on average. Teaching loads range from one to eight classes. Almost one-fourth of Chapter 1 teachers also teach regular classes, averaging two such classes each day. The regular education classes taught by Chapter 1 teachers mainly include reading, language arts, mathematics, social/life skills, and GED preparation or adult basic education.

On average, Chapter 1 teachers in correctional facilities spend 37 hours per week in their instructional duties (Table 5-7). Chapter 1 teachers in adult facilities spend somewhat more time in actual classroom instruction and less time in classroom preparation, social interaction with students, and staff meetings or in-service training than do teachers in youth facilities.

Table 5-7. Average Number of Hours Spent per Week on Activities by Chapter 1 N or D and Regular Teachers, by Type of Facility

	Hours per Week		
Chapter 1	Youth Facility (n = 346)	Adult Facility (n = 171)	Total (n = 567)
Instruction inside classroom	24.8	28.6	25.9
Classroom preparation	7.8	5.6	7.1
Conversation with students	2.2	1.6	2.0
Outside classroom staff meeting or in-service training	2.5	1.8	2.3
Total	37.3	37.6	37.3
Regular	(n = 2,413)	(n = 1,241)	(n = 3,654)
Instruction inside classroom	26.4	24.0	25.6
Classroom preparation	6.7	7.0	6.8
Conversation with students	3.8	2.4	3.3
Outside classroom staff meeting or in-service training	2.3	0.8	1.8
Total	39.2	34.2	37.5

Regular education teachers also spend about 37 hours per week on average in their instructional duties. In youth facilities, however, they average 39 hours per week, compared with 34 hours for regular education teachers in adult facilities.

Chapter 1 N or D teachers estimated that, on average, 70 percent of their time is spent in academic interaction, 16 percent in personal/social development activities, and 13 percent in noninstructional tasks. The amount of time Chapter 1 teachers reported spending in academic interaction ranges from almost none to 95 percent of the time. Regular teachers reported

60 percent of classroom time spent in academic interaction on average and 23 percent of time spent in noninstructional activities.

Teachers then described their instructional methodology for the 60 to 70 percent of classroom time in which they academically engage their students. Chapter 1 N or D and regular education teachers reported similar use of their instructional time: somewhat less than 45 percent presenting or explaining information to students, slightly more than 25 percent monitoring student academic performance, 20 percent providing feedback to students, and more than 10 percent in other academic interaction.

Teachers estimated the relative influence of specific noninstructional activities in accounting for the use of classroom time (Table 5-8). Almost one-half of instructional time that is spent in noninstructional activities goes to behavior management; more than one-third is spent in classroom management (distributing materials, giving directions, and reporting attendance).

Estimates of student time use were also obtained (Table 5-9). Estimates of engaged student time varied from virtually no student task engagement to 100 percent engagement. Chapter 1 teachers reported their students to be more highly task engaged at an average of 80 percent, compared with 70 percent task engagement in regular classrooms. This self-reported frequency is similar to the observed frequency of task engagement reported in the substudy of effective practices conducted in 1978.

A major finding of this study was that students in Chapter 1 N or D institutions are frequently absent from class for various reasons, including participation in other institutional activities. As a measure of missed opportunities for learning, Table 5-10 shows the reported frequency of student absences from classes for various reasons. Teacher responses vary only slightly for regular and Chapter 1 teachers. About two-thirds of teachers in both adult and youth institutions reported that assignment to a work detail almost never is a reason for class absence. The most frequent reason cited for absences is security or disciplinary actions for students. More than 50 percent of teachers reported that disciplinary actions are sometimes or frequently a reason for student absence; more than one-fourth of teachers in adult institutions reported that disciplinary actions are a frequent reason for student absence. In youth facilities, 15 percent of teachers additionally cite students' assignment to other institutional activities (e.g., kitchen duty) as a reason for frequent absences.

Table 5-8. Average Percent of Time Spent on Selected Noninstructional Activities for Chapter 1 N or D and Regular Teachers, by Type of Facility

	Average Percent of Time		
Chapter 1	Youth Facility (n = 402)	Adult Facility (n = 154)	Total (n = 556)
Behavior management	52	39	49
Management tasks	32	48	36
Other activities	16	12	15
Total	100	100	100
Regular	(n = 2,429)	(n = 1,241)	(n = 3,670)
Behavior management	50	45	48
Management tasks	31	41	34
Other activities	19	14	18
Total	100	100	100

Table 5-9. Average Percent of Time Students Are Actively Engaged in Academic Activities by Chapter 1 N or D and Regular Program Teachers, by Type Facility

Chapter 1	Youth Facility (n = 394)	Adult Facility (n = 171)	Total (average) (n = 565)
Average percent of student time spent in academic activities	79	82	8
Minimum percent of time	20	60	20
Maximum percent of time	100	95	100
Regular	(n = 2,424)	(n = 1,241)	(n = 3,670)
Average percent of student time spent in academic activities	71	69	70
Minimum percent of time	10	0	0
Maximum percent of time	100	100	100

Table 5-10. Reasons for Student Absences Reported by Chapter 1 N or D and Regular Program Teachers, by Type of Facility

	Percent of Chapter 1 and Regular Program Teachers Reported Reason							
	Youth Facility (n = 2,830)				Adult Facility (n = 1,410)			
Reason	Almost never	Some-times	Fre-quently	Total	Almost never	Some-times	Fre-quently	Total
Work detail	63	35	3	101	65	34	1	100
Counseling	42	56	3	101	35	63	2	100
Security/discipline	14	73	14	101	19	55	27	101
Other institutional activities	21	65	15	101	25	69	6	100

Given the correctional environment in which they operate and the multitude of sometimes conflicting institutional objectives that coexist, teachers provided descriptions of the types and magnitudes of problems that security measures pose for instruction. About one-half of teachers reported that security measures pose no problems for them in their instructional activities. Of those reporting problems posed by security, the most pervasive problems for both Chapter 1 and regular teachers in both adult and youth facilities were the fact that equipment has to be locked up and is hard to access, the lack of free movement between classrooms, and the lack of adequate security.

Other problems posed by security were reported differentially by teachers in youth and adult facilities. Probably because of the more prevalent use of positive peer culture in youth facilities, teachers in these facilities report problems as a result of the restriction of groups of students from attending class more frequently than do teachers in adult facilities (Table 5-11). (The philosophy of this approach to therapy and discipline--that an individual's behavior is the responsibility of the group--results in rewarding or punishing the entire group for the actions of an individual or a few members.)

Resource Availability and Utilization. In Chapter 1 programs in youth facilities, the materials most frequently used are workbooks, practice sheets, and teacher-developed materials;

in adult facilities they are textbooks, computers, and workbooks and practice sheets. About 40 percent of Chapter 1 teachers in adult facilities and almost 50 percent of Chapter 1 teachers in youth facilities use life skills materials. Regular education teachers also use workbooks and practice sheets, textbooks, and teacher-developed materials but use fewer computers and life skills materials.

About 50 percent of all teachers reported that some materials are not available in sufficient quantity to meet their instructional needs. Insufficient materials were reported significantly more often by teachers in youth facilities than in adult facilities. Both Chapter 1 and regular teachers cited the need for computers and computer software as their top priority (Table 5-12). Chapter 1 teachers ranked vocational education equipment and materials with basic skills applications as the next highest need, followed by more workbooks and practice sheets. While the priority of needs for regular teachers differs between adult and youth facilities, regular teachers consistently identify computers, audiovisual equipment, textbooks, and life skills materials as the most needed instructional materials.

Table 5-11. Problems Created by Security Measures, by Type of Facility

Problem	Percent of Chapter 1 and Regular Program Teachers Reporting		
Problem	Youth Facility (n = 2,831)	Adult Facility (n = 1,409)	Total (average) (n = 4,240)
Classes are often shut down for security reasons	11	13	12
There is a lack of free movement between classrooms	19	18	19
There is a lack of adequate security	24	21	23
Classroom doors have to be locked	22	9	17
Equipment has to be locked up and is hard to get at	27	40	31
Classroom materials are subject to censorship	11	21	15
Groups of students are restricted from coming to class	19	1	13
Certain groups of students are not allowed in the same classroom together	16	9	14
Custody personnel interfere with the educational program	13	10	12

Table 5-12. Percent of Teachers Indicating Insufficient Quantity of Materials and Ranking of Insufficient Quantities of Materials by Chapter 1 N or D and Regular Program Teachers and by Type of Facility

Chapter 1	Youth Facility (n = 402)	Adult Facility (n = 171)	Total (average) (n = 573)
Percent reporting insufficient quantities of materials	56	35	50
Ranking of insufficient materials[a]			
Computers	1	1	1
Computer software	2	2	2
Vocational education equipment and materials	3	3	3
Workbooks and practice sheets	4	--	4
Life skills materials	5	4	5
Audiovisual equipment and materials	6	5	6
Textbooks	7	--	7
Regular	(n = 2,429)	(n = 1,241)	(n = 3,670)
Percent reporting insufficient quantities of materials	56	32	48
Ranking of insufficient materials[a]			
Computers	1	2	1
Computer software	--	--	--
Vocational education equipment and materials	--	--	--
Workbooks and practice sheets	--	--	--
Life skills materials	4	4	4
Audiovisual equipment and materials	3	1	2
Textbooks	2	3	3
Manipulative materials	5	--	5
Programmed materials	6	5	6

[a] Based on percentages of teachers responding to each item, with 1 being the most frequently cited materials in insufficient quantity.

Among Chapter 1 N or D teachers, 80 percent select materials based on level of student achievement, and 16 percent select materials based on grade level. Among regular education teachers, 53 percent select materials based on level of achievement, and 31 percent use

grade level as the determining criterion (Table 5-13). Ninety-five percent of both Chapter 1 and regular teachers report that instructional materials used match their students' level of ability.

However, despite teachers' overall satisfaction with the fit between instructional materials and students' ability levels, two problems remain in some places. First, for 40 percent of Chapter 1 teachers and one-third of regular education teachers, materials are appropriate to the student's ability but not to the students' age. Second, more than one-fourth of Chapter 1 teachers and 20 percent of regular teachers report that instructional materials do not match their students' level of English language proficiency.

Table 5-13. Basis of Choice of Materials for Teaching by Chapter 1 N or D and Regular Program Teachers, by Type of Facility

	Percent of Teachers Choosing Materials		
Chapter 1	Youth Facility (n = 396)	Adult Facility (n = 163)	Total (n = 559)
Grade level	12	25	16
Achievement level	80	75	78
English-language proficiency level	1	0	1
None of the above is primary	7	0	5
Regular	(n = 2,396)	(n = 1,177)	(n = 3,670)
Grade level	29	35	31
Achievement level	57	44	53
English-language proficiency level	9	0	6
None of the above is primary	5	21	10

Instructional Methods

More than three-fourths of Chapter 1 N or D instruction and almost 60 percent of regular instruction is provided via an individualized approach. Students typically work on packets of materials or worksheets that have been selected to match individually diagnosed skill deficiencies. More than 40 percent of regular education teachers provide opportunities for some instructional interaction among students through small-group or whole-class instruction. Chapter 1 teachers in adult facilities use individual instructional approaches almost exclusively; regular teachers in adult facilities also generally rely on the individualized approach.

When asked how they assess student progress, almost three-fourths of Chapter 1 N or D teachers reported that they use each of three types of measures: standardized achievement tests, diagnostic tests, and teacher judgment (Table 5-14). Among regular teachers, the most common measures of progress are criterion-referenced test scores, individualized skills inventories, and teacher judgment. Regular teachers rely less on standardized achievement or diagnostic test scores for assessing student progress than do Chapter 1 teachers. Almost 90 percent of Chapter 1 teachers in youth facilities and 63 percent in adult facilities obtain information from other teachers. Teachers in adult facilities are much less likely to obtain information on student progress from other teachers, regardless of whether they are Chapter 1 or regular teachers.

Virtually all teachers (95 percent) have individualized instructional plans containing performance objectives for their students. Approximately 10 percent of Chapter 1 N or D teachers and 29 percent of regular teachers report that student performance objectives are not updated once they are established (Table 5-15). The tendency to refrain from updating established performance objectives is especially prevalent among regular teachers in youth facilities. About one-third of Chapter 1 and regular teachers update performance objectives at least weekly, and half of Chapter 1 teachers update them monthly or less frequently.

Almost all teachers in youth facilities report that they share information on student progress with treatment staff, but about one-third of teachers in adult facilities never do so. Virtually all teachers in the sample share progress information with their students. Seventy percent of Chapter 1 teachers and regular teachers in youth facilities provide feedback to students

at least weekly, 20 percent monthly, and 10 percent less often than monthly. Regular teachers in adult facilities provide feedback somewhat less frequently, with 60 percent providing feedback to students weekly.

Table 5-14. Progress Measurements Used by Chapter 1 N or D and Regular Program Teachers, by Type of Facility

	Youth Facility		Adult Facility		Total (average)	
Chapter 1	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%
Standardized achievement test scores	(390)	76	(171)	67	(561)	73
Standardized diagnostic test scores	(390)	70	(171)	70	(561)	70
English language proficiency test scores	(390)	16	(171)	3	(561)	36
Criterion or objective referenced test scores	(390)	32	(171)	46	(561)	36
Individualized-skills inventory	(390)	62	(171)	58	(561)	61
Other teacher judgments	(390)	78	(171)	52	(561)	70
Regular	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%
Standardized achievement test scores	(2,392)	38	(1,135)	63	(3,527)	46
Standardized diagnostic test scores	(2,218)	24	(1,099)	56	(3,318)	34
English language proficiency test scores	(2,281)	23	(1,055)	26	(3,336)	24
Criterion or objective referenced test scores	(2,306)	57	(1,061)	67	(3,367)	60
Individualized-skills inventory	(2,367)	59	(1,173)	81	(3,539)	66
Other teacher judgments	(2,296)	59	(1,173)	58	(3,469)	59

Table 5-15. Extent to Which Chapter 1 N or D and Regular Program Teachers Update Student Performance Objectives, by Type and Facility

	Percent of Teachers Responding		
Chapter 1	Youth Facility (n = 395)	Adult Facility (n = 171)	Total (n = 566)
We have no individual student performance objectives	0	14	4
We have individual student performance objectives, but they are not updated after they are established	8	14	10
Daily	5	26	19
Weekly	20	9	16
Monthly	41	19	35
Less than monthly	16	18	16
Regular	(n = 2,357)	(n = 1,162)	(n = 3,519)
We have no individual student performance objectives	0	1	0
We have individual student performance objectives, but they are not updated after they are established	38	11	29
Daily	6	29	14
Weekly	18	25	20
Monthly	25	20	23
Less than monthly	13	14	14

Overall, 42 percent of Chapter 1 N or D teachers consult the regular teachers in developing lesson plans for Chapter 1 N or D students. This level of interaction for planning may be understated, however, because 20 percent of teachers responded not applicable, presumably

because they are both the Chapter 1 teacher and the regular teacher. Two-thirds of Chapter 1 teachers reported that they discuss the instructional needs of Chapter 1 students with regular teachers.

Chapter 1 N or D teachers responded to a series of statements describing effective instructional practices by reporting the frequency of occurrence of each practice in their classrooms (Table 5-16). Chapter 1 teachers indicated that each instructional technique occurs with some frequency; that is, none is totally absent. Among frequency categories describing instructional practices as occurring sometimes, frequently, or almost always, about 80 percent of Chapter 1 teachers reported that their feedback on student performance is almost always immediate. However, significantly fewer reported that they almost always provide specific feedback that refers to skill competencies. Fifty-five percent of Chapter 1 teachers in youth facilities but fewer than 40 percent in adult facilities reported that they almost always provided this kind of specific feedback to students.

About 50 percent of teachers in youth facilities and 43 percent in adult facilities reported that they almost always ask students questions to check for understanding. Virtually all Chapter 1 N or D teachers ask questions frequently. Chapter 1 teachers also reported that they frequently provide opportunities for skill and knowledge applications to real-life situations. Some 68 percent of Chapter 1 teachers in youth facilities and 53 percent of teachers in adult facilities reported that Chapter 1 students work at academic tasks that provide at least 80 percent rate of success--a rate that is commonly cited as a minimum level for skill mastery.

Twenty-two percent of Chapter 1 teachers in youth facilities reported that students almost always seek clarification about directions, and 31 percent reported that students sometimes seek clarification. To the extent that teachers provide clear directions and students are clear about performance expectations, the frequency of this means of instructional interaction is expected to be low. The need for frequent directions is further minimized by student engagement in instructional tasks that ensure a high rate of success. Similarly, there could be many reasons why fewer than half of Chapter 1 teachers in youth and adult facilities reported they almost always reteach skills or concepts that students do not initially understand; the low reported rate for this practice does not necessarily indicate a flaw in instruction.

Table 5-16. Frequency of Occurrence of Selected Instructional Methods in Chapter 1 N or D Classroom Instruction, by Type of Facility

Method	Percent of Chapter 1 N or D Teachers Responding							
	Youth Facility (n=402)				Adult Facility (n=171)			
	Never	Sometimes	Frequently	Almost Always	Never	Sometimes	Frequently	Almost Always
Students seek clarification about directions	1	31	4	22	0	34	45	22
Reteaching is provided	0	20	36	44	0	12	42	46
Students are asked questions to check for understanding	0	4	46	50	0	7	49	43
Students work at academic tasks that provide at least 80 percent rate of success	0	2	30	68	0	0	47	53
Opportunities are provided for skill and knowledge applications to real-life situations	0	14	31	55	0	9	50	41
Feedback on performance is specific and refers to skill competencies	0	5	41	55	0	0	39	
Feedback on performance is immediate	0	7	17	77	0	0	18	82

Regular teachers also described the frequency of these instructional methods for their students (Table 5-17). For each effective instructional practice, regular teachers reported a much lower frequency than Chapter 1 teachers. Compared with the 80 percent of Chapter 1 teachers who reported that they almost always provide immediate feedback on student performance, only 27 percent of regular teachers in youth facilities and 51 percent in adult facilities said that they do so. Regular teachers in adult facilities are more successful than their Chapter 1 counterparts in providing specific feedback that makes reference to skill competencies, but regular teachers in youth facilities reported the lowest rate of specific feedback. Similarly, these teachers are the least likely to almost always ask questions to check for understanding. Compared with teachers overall, fewer regular teachers in adult facilities reported they provide opportunities for skill and knowledge applications to real life situations. As many as one-fourth of regular teachers reported that students only sometimes work at academic tasks that provide at least an 80 percent rate of success.

Teachers described the frequency with which they incorporated positive expectations for student performance and instructional interaction in their teaching approach (Table 5-18). Chapter 1 teachers in both youth and adult facilities reported they almost always clearly communicate the belief that all students can learn; communicate respect, interest, and caring; and set challenging yet realistic goals for students (although teachers in youth facilities reported a somewhat lower frequency of setting such goals). All teachers reported a lower frequency of communicating high achievement expectations--especially in adult facilities--and incorporating student choice of learning activities into classroom practices. For each effective practice, regular teacher results are similar to those of Chapter 1 N or D teachers, although the former reported a lower frequency of being almost always successful than did Chapter 1 teachers.

Chapter 1 N or D teachers responded to a series of questions regarding their expectations for the achievement of Chapter 1 students. Only 7 percent of Chapter 1 teachers disagree that Chapter 1 students can learn about as well as any other student given good instruction. About 10 percent agreed that these students do not want to learn, and about 93 percent believe that improving the student's self-concept as a learner is particularly important for Chapter 1 students. Eighty-six percent of Chapter 1 teachers in youth facilities and 62 percent in adult facilities agreed that Chapter 1 students have shorter attention spans than other students.

Table 5-17. Frequency of Occurrence of Selected Instructional Methods in Regular Program Classroom Instruction, by Type of Facility

Method	Percent of Regular Program Teachers Responding							
	Youth Facility (n = 2,424)				Adult Facility (n = 1,241)			
	Never	Sometimes	Frequently	Almost Always	Never	Sometimes	Almost Frequently	Always
Students seek clarification about directions	0	32	53	16	11	24	53	11
Reteaching is provided	2	23	37	38	2	17	41	40
Students are asked questions to check for understanding	2	16	45	37	0	7	45	48
Students work at academic tasks that provide at least 80 percent rate of success	0	25	37	39	2	26	44	28
Opportunities are provided for skill and knowledge applications to real-life situations	4	20	35	41	12	17	42	30
Feedback on performance is specific and refers to skill competencies	2	14	55	28	0	1	51	48
Feedback on performance is immediate	0	20	53	27	0	12	37	51

Table 5-18. Frequency of Chapter 1 N or D Teacher Characteristics, by Type of Facility

Characteristic	Percent of Chapter 1 N or D Teachers Responding							
	Youth Facility				Adult Facility			
	(n)	Never	Fre-quently	Almost always	(n)	Never	Fre-quently	Almost always
I communicate high achievement expectations	(395)	0	39	61	(171)	0	49	51
I clearly express the belief that all students can learn	(402)	0	10	90	(171)	0	9	91
I communicate respect, interest, and caring	(402)	0	15	85	(171)	0	13	87
I set challenging yet realistic goals for students	(402)	0	32	68	(171)	0	22	78
I incorporate student choice of learning activities into my classroom practices	(395)	0	58	42	(166)	0	56	43

Administrative Leadership

The concept--and practice--of administrative leadership is essential to the effective operation of any organization. The extent to which teachers and administrators regularly work together is reflected in program functioning and output. Almost all Chapter 1 N or D teachers

meet with education administrators at least once a year to participate in an overall assessment of educational needs and to develop plans and procedures for the regular education program. However, when asked whether they participate in meetings with administrative staff to identify program needs, develop regular program plans and procedures, and develop Chapter 1 program plans and procedures (Table 5-19), approximately 10 percent of Chapter 1 teachers reported never meeting with educational administrative staff on the Chapter 1 program. Seventy percent of Chapter 1 teachers in youth facilities and 86 percent of those in adult facilities reported that they meet with administrators to develop plans and procedures for the Chapter 1 program one or more times a year, but not as often as monthly. Only in adult facilities do as many as one-third of regular education teachers meet regarding the Chapter 1 program with any frequency. Twenty-two percent of regular teachers in youth facilities report that they never participate in yearly overall assessment meetings with education administrators.

The fact that teachers and administrators do not develop plans together may have adverse implications for program development and administration. Teacher morale is impaired by a sense of isolation, teachers may be unaware of ancillary yet key policy decisions and mandates, and feedback necessary for program change and innovation from the source of program implementation is lacking.

Teachers responded to a series of statements that describe instructional leadership characteristics of effective administrators for Chapter 1 N or D and regular programs, including the following:

- Establishment of goals that are clearly articulated;
- Communication of positive attitudes to students, teachers, and other staff;
- Cooperative planning to implement program improvement efforts;
- Active support of educational programs;
- Demonstrated interpersonal and organizational management skills; and
- Active observation of classroom instruction and provision of feedback to teachers.

Table 5-19. Frequency of Meetings for Chapter 1 N or D and Regular Program Teachers, by Type of Facility

	Percent of Teachers Responding[a]											
	Youth Facility						Adult Facility					
Chapter 1	(n)	Weekly	Monthly	One or more times per year	Never	NA	(n)	Weekly	Monthly	One or more times per year	Never	NA
Meet with educational administrative staff to identify program needs	(393)	29	6	58	3	4	(171)	5	40	43	0	12
Participate in meetings on education program/ plans procedures	(388)	24	20	51	5	0	(171)	0	21	62	0	17
Participate in meetings on Chapter 1 program/ plans procedures	(382)	10	10	70	10	--	(171)	0	3	86	6	5
Regular												
Meet with educational administrative staff to identify program needs	(2,429)	30	12	39	18	--	(1,241)	11	38	42	9	--
Participate in meetings on education program/ plans procedures	(2,429)	12	30	35	22	1	(1,241)	10	46	42	2	0
Participate in meetings on Chapter 1 program/ plans procedures	(2,429)	6	6	12	53	23	(1,241)	5	5	31	23	36

[a] The rows may not sum to 100 percent because of rounding.

Generally, if Chapter 1 teachers did not agree that their administrator demonstrated a particular characteristic of effective instructional leadership, they reported themselves as neutral on the topic rather than openly disagreeing with statements (Tables 5-20 and 5-21). Regular teachers were more likely to disagree with statements. For all but one characteristic of effective leadership, teachers in youth facilities expressed more frequent dissent with positive descriptions than did teachers in adult facilities. Regular teachers in youth facilities were the least likely to agree that educational administrators were effective instructional leaders.

Almost all Chapter 1 teachers in adult facilities and 85 percent in youth facilities agreed that their administrator actively supports the Chapter 1 program. While Chapter 1 teachers in youth facilities agreed that in general administrators express this support by communicating positive attitudes about the program to students, teachers, and other staff, those in adult facilities were less likely to report that their administrator fosters such positive communication. Eighty percent agreed that administrators cooperatively engage Chapter 1 teachers in implementing program improvement efforts. Almost all Chapter 1 teachers in adult facilities and 72 percent in youth facilities agreed that their administrator demonstrates interpersonal and organizational management skills. Areas in which Chapter 1 teachers are least likely to perceive effective instructional leadership are establishing and communicating clear goals and providing helpful feedback to teachers.

For each characteristic of effective leadership, 40 to 50 percent of regular teachers in youth facilities are neutral or disagree that their educational administrators have this characteristic. From one-fourth to one-third of regular teachers in adult facilities express similar perceptions. About half the regular teachers in youth institutions indicate a lack of established, articulated goals as well as a lack of interpersonal, organizational, and management skills among educational administrators.

Perceptions of Effectiveness

Both Chapter 1 and regular teachers were asked, in open-ended questions, their perceptions of the three most important factors that promote learning in their classrooms and the three most important factors that obstruct learning. About half of all the responses from Chapter 1 teachers reflect a belief that their instructional techniques are the major factors promoting learning (Table

5-22). Characteristics of instructional techniques include small class size, the variety and interest level of materials used, the supportive classroom environment, the fact that teachers have organized, their instruction, and their teachers' presentation and monitoring skills.

Table 5-20. Chapter 1 N or D Teachers' Responses Regarding Attitudes and Behavior of Administrators Toward Chapter 1 N or D Programs, by Type of Facility

	Percent of Chapter 1 Teachers Responding							
	Youth Facility				Adult Facility			
Characteristic	(n)	Agree	Neutral	Dis-agree	(n)	Agree	Neutral	Dis-agree
Administrators have established goals for the Chapter 1 program and clearly articulate them	(402)	66	24	10	(168)	72	27	1
Administrators communicate positive attitudes about the Chapter 1 program to students, teachers, and other staff	(402)	85	10	5	(171)	78	17	5
Administrators plan cooperatively with Chapter 1 teachers to implement program improvement efforts	(402)	80	14	6	(168)	82	17	1
Administrators actively support the Chapter 1 program	(402)	72	17	11	(160)	99	1	0
Administrators demonstrate interpersonal and organizational management skills	(402)	72	17	22	(168)	93	6	1
Administrators observe classroom instruction and provide helpful feedback	(402)	66	24	10	(168)	72	27	1

Table 5-21. Regular Program Teachers' Responses Regarding Attitudes and Behavior of Administrators Toward Chapter 1 N or D Programs, by Type of Facility

Characteristic	Percent of Regular Program Teachers Responding							
	Youth Facility				Adult Facility			
	(n)	Agree	Neutral	Dis-agree	(n)	Agree	Neutral	Dis-agree
Administrators have established goals for the Chapter 1 program and clearly articulate them	(2,429)	50	15	35	(1,241)	71	9	20
Administrators communicate positive attitudes about the Chapter 1 program to students, teachers, and other staff	(2,429)	58	20	22	(1,241)	74	18	8
Administrators plan cooperatively with Chapter 1 teachers to implement program improvement efforts	(2,429)	57	17	26	(1,241)	74	4	22
Administrators actively support the Chapter 1 program	(2,375)	59	39	2	(1,241)	67	32	1
Administrators demonstrate interpersonal and organizational management skills	(2,429)	48	30	22	(1,241)	75	6	19
Administrators observe classroom instruction and provide helpful feedback	(2,429)	57	15	28	(1,241)	69	14	17

Table 5-22. Factors Identified by Chapter 1 N or D Teachers as Most Likely to Promote Learning, by Type of Facility

Factor	Percent of Chapter 1 Teacher Responding[a]		
	Youth Facility	Adult Facility	Total (average)
Staff Characteristics:			
Positive attitudes toward students	14	5	11
High expectations for students	2	2	2
Dedicated staff	3	4	3
Improved staff communication	11	16	12
Subtotal	30	27	28
Instructional Characteristics:			
Limited class size	12	14	13
Variety and interest of materials	15	6	12
Well-organized instruction	11	10	11
Supportive environment	5	17	0
Reduced distractions	2	0	1
Presentations/monitoring skills	4	6	5
Subtotal	49	53	50
Student Characteristics:			
Student desire to learn	17	14	16
Other	4	6	5
Subtotal	21	20	21
Total	100%	100%	99%

[a] Some columns do not add to 100 percent because of rounding.

About 30 percent of the responses from Chapter 1 teachers indicate that the teachers perceive their own attitudinal, interpersonal, and communicative characteristics as a source of instructional effectiveness.

Chapter 1 N or D teachers cite their own positive attitudes toward students, their improved communication with other staff, their dedication, and their high expectations for student performance as important factors contributing to their effectiveness. Only 20 percent of the responses from Chapter 1 teachers identify student characteristics as a major source for effective learning; among these responses, teachers most often cited the students' desire to learn as an important element.

Regular education teachers in adult facilities report perceptions of factors contributing to effective instruction similar to those of Chapter 1 teachers (Table 5-23). That is, 50 percent of all the responses reflect a belief that the teachers' instructional characteristics are a source of effective learning, while 27 percent of the responses pertain to teachers' own interactional qualities. Regular teachers in youth facilities are less likely to perceive characteristics of their instruction as the source of learning. Regular teachers in youth facilities are substantially less likely to perceive their instructional materials as sufficient, adequate, or high interest than are regular teachers in adult facilities or Chapter 1 teachers overall.

About one-third of the responses from regular program teachers cite the characteristics of students as a source of improved learning, especially in regard to their desire to learn. Teachers' own positive attitudes toward students are perceived as a major factor promoting learning.

Teachers also provided their perceptions of factors obstructing learning in the classroom. The list of factors obstructing learning is much longer than the list of those promoting learning. Primary among them are problems associated with the characteristics of students. About 60 percent of the responses from Chapter 1 teachers indicate that characteristics of their students are the major factors inhibiting learning (Table 5-24). The most frequently cited problems are low self-esteem and student behavior problems, many of which are perceived to emanate from extreme peer pressure in institutional settings.

Table 5-23. Factors Identified by Regular Program Teachers as Most Likely to Promote Learning, by Type of Facility

Factors Responding[a]	Percent of Regular Program Teachers		
	Youth Facility	Adult Facility	Total (average)
Staff Characteristics:			
Positive attitudes toward students	19	13	17
High expectations for students	0	2	1
Dedicated staff	0	0	0
Improved staff communication	7	12	9
Subtotal	27	27	28
Instructional Characteristics:			
Limited class size	4	7	5
Variety and interest of materials	11	20	14
Well-organized instruction	10	9	10
Supportive environment	9	8	9
Reduced distractions	0	0	0
Presentations/monitoring skills	3	6	4
Subtotal	37	50	42
Student Characteristics:			
Student desire to learn	26	22	25
Good behavior	3	0	2
Other	7	1	5
Subtotal	36	23	32
Total	100%	100%	102%

[a] Some columns do not add to 100 percent because of rounding.

Table 5-24. Factors Identified by Chapter 1 N or D Teachers as Most Likely to Obstruct Learning, by Type of Facility

Factor	Percent of Chapter 1 Teacher Responding		
	Youth Facility	Adult Facility	Total (average)
Institutional Characteristics:			
Poor administration	1	0	1
Frequent class interruptions	8	0	5
Overcrowded classes	6	9	7
Understaffing	3	5	3
Irregular class attendance or attendance not required	10	22	14
Insufficient time allotted for education/ frequent relocation of students	2	0	2
Insufficient materials	6	1	4
Subtotal	36	37	36
Staff Characteristics:			
Poor organization for instruction	3	3	3
Inadequate preparation time	3	1	3
Subtotal	6	4	6
Student Characteristics:			
Low self-esteem	19	24	21
Poor reading skills	1	2	1
Student behavior problems/peer pressure	26	19	24
Lack of trust and maturity	3	5	3
History of school failure	2	3	2
Existence of learning disabilities	4	4	4
Diversity of learning needs	<1	0	0
Other	3	2	3
Subtotal	58	59	58
Total	100%	100%	100%

In general, although institutional factors are not much perceived as a great source for promoting effective instruction, they are perceived as a great source for obstructing effective instruction. Ten percent of Chapter 1 teachers in youth facilities and 22 percent in adult facilities experienced the view that irregular or nonmandatory attendance is the major factor obstructing learning that could be improved at the institutional level, particularly in adult facilities. Overcrowded Chapter 1 classrooms were reported in both youth and adult facilities. Chapter 1 teachers in youth facilities indicated that learning is obstructed by frequent class interruptions and that there are insufficient materials of good quality.

Only about 5 percent of the responses from Chapter 1 teachers cited teachers' own characteristics as factors obstructing learning in the classroom. Sources of perceived teacher ineffectiveness are poor organization for instruction and inadequate preparation time.

Regular teachers also provided perceptions of the factors that obstruct learning in their classrooms (Table 5-25). About half of the responses from regular teachers cited student characteristics as a factor impeding learning. Student behavior problems/peer pressure and low self-esteem are the most frequently cited obstructions. Among both regular and Chapter 1 teachers, student behavior problems were cited more often in youth facilities than in adult facilities. Forty-two percent of the responses from regular teachers cited institutional characteristics as an obstruction to effective learning; in adult facilities, 50 percent of the responses dealt with such problems. The main institutional obstructions cited are overcrowded classes, insufficient materials of good quality, insufficient time allotted for education (especially within adult facilities), and frequent interruptions to classroom instruction. The 7 percent of responses citing staff characteristics as obstructions to effective learning specified teachers' poor organization for instruction and inadequate classroom preparation time as the main source of ineffectiveness.

Summary

On average, Chapter 1 N or D and regular program teachers have worked in their present facility for the past 7 years. Chapter 1 teachers have an average of 15 years of total teaching experience, including 6 years of teaching Chapter 1. Regular program teachers have a

Table 5-25. Factors Identified by Regular Program Teachers as Most Likely to Obstruct Learning, by Type of Facility

Factors	Percent of Regular Program Teachers Responding		
	Youth Facility	Adult Facility	Total (average)
Institutional Characteristics:			
Poor administration	3	2	3
Frequent class interruptions	6	5	6
Overcrowded classes	10	7	9
Understaffing	1	4	2
Irregular class attendance or attendance not required	<1	7	3
Insufficient time allotted for education/ frequent relocation of students	5	13	7
Insufficient materials	8	8	8
Subtotal	38	50	42
Staff Characteristics:			
Poor organization for instruction	4	0	3
Inadequate preparation time	4	5	4
Subtotal	8	5	7
Student Characteristics:			
Low self-esteem	15	19	16
Poor reading skills	2	3	2
Student behavior problems/peer pressure	23	16	21
Lack of trust and maturity	3	1	2
History of school failure	3	2	3
Existence of learning disabilities	1	2	1
Diversity of learning needs	4	0	3
Other	4	0	3
Subtotal	54	44	51
Total	100%	99%	100%

similar total amount of experience. Chapter 1 teachers in adult institutions have about 1 year of additional Chapter 1 experience in correctional institutions and almost 3 years of prior teaching experience in noncorrectional settings. All teachers in participating facilities have experience and educational background comparable to those of the teaching force in public schools. A majority of both Chapter 1 and regular education teachers are satisfied with their current job; about 70 percent indicating they would continue to work in their current facility.

Virtually all teachers in participating facilities are full-time employees. Chapter 1 teachers are slightly more likely to have at least a bachelor's degree and to be state certified than are regular education teachers. Seven percent of Chapter 1 teachers and 9 percent of regular education teachers are not certified in the areas they teach. On average, Chapter 1 teachers in youth facilities have received twice as much in-service training as teachers in adult facilities.

More than half of all Chapter 1 teachers teach Chapter 1 reading, 40 percent teach mathematics, and 35 percent teach combined reading/language arts and mathematics classes. Nearly one-third of all Chapter 1 teachers provide instruction in social or life skills, including 57 percent of those in adult facilities. Both Chapter 1 and regular instructors teach an average of five classes per day.

Both Chapter 1 and regular education teachers spend about 37 hours per week on instructional duties. Within the classroom, Chapter 1 teachers spend about 70 percent of their time on academic interaction, compared with about 61 percent for regular program teachers. Both types of teachers report spending about half of their noninstructional time on behavior management.

Approximately half of all teachers report that security measures do not pose particular problems for instruction. Among those teachers reporting such problems, the three most pervasive problems for both Chapter 1 and regular teachers are the need to lock up equipment, the lack of free movement between classrooms, and inadequate security.

Although 80 percent of Chapter 1 teachers select materials based on student achievement level, only about half of regular education teachers base their selection on this criterion. Thirty percent of these teachers rely on grade level when selecting instructional materials. Although in general teachers perceive that instructional materials fit their students'

ability levels, some reported problems in matching materials to students' age or degree of English-language proficiency. The materials used most frequently by both types of teachers are workbooks, practice sheets, and
teacher-developed materials. Regular education teachers less often use life skills materials and computers. About half of all teachers indicated that the supply of some materials is inadequate; both groups of teachers gave top priority to computers.

While a majority of both Chapter 1 N or D teachers and regular teachers use scores on diagnostic tests for instructional decision making, the Chapter 1 teachers more often use standardized tests in this way than regular teachers. Virtually all teachers use individualized instruction plans containing performance objectives for their students. Over three-fourths of Chapter 1 instruction and nearly 60 percent of regular instruction is provided in a totally individualized setting.

In comparison with regular education teachers, Chapter 1 teachers more frequently reported that they employ a number of specific instructional methods thought to be effective, such as providing immediate feedback on student performance. While 77 percent of Chapter 1 teachers in youth facilities and 82 percent of Chapter 1 teachers in adult facilities almost always provide immediate feedback, just 27 and 51 percent of regular education teachers in these types of facilities, respectively, follow such a procedure.

When Chapter 1 teachers were asked to identify three factors promoting effective learning, nearly half of the total number of responses referred to instructional techniques, such as small class size and a supportive classroom environment. Thirty percent of the responses were related to teachers' attitudinal and interpersonal characteristics, such as a positive attitude toward students, and 20 percent were associated with student characteristics such as a desire to learn. In adult facilities, regular teachers reported similar factors as contributing to effective instruction. In youth facilities regular education teachers were less likely to cite characteristics of their own instruction and more likely to cite student characteristics.

Responses from both Chapter 1 and regular education teachers typically identified the obstacles to effective instruction as student characteristics, such as poor self-esteem and behavior problems.

Neither Chapter 1 nor regular program teachers meet with education program administrators monthly to discuss program plans, procedures, or needs. While teachers perceive that administrators support the Chapter 1 program, they reported some weaknesses in communicating clear goals and providing feedback to teachers.

6. ADMINISTRATION OF THE CHAPTER 1 N OR D PROGRAM

Administration of the Chapter 1 N or D program involves the SEA, one or more SAAs in each state, and the participating facilities. The SEA receives an overall state allocation from the federal government and distributes these funds to one or more SAAs that submit applications to it. These applications, in turn, reflect applications from individual facilities to the SAA. An SAA may be a state corrections department, a human services agency, a specialized school district, a community college, or the SEA itself acting as the SAA. Juvenile facilities often report to one state agency, while adult facilities are primarily accountable to another. Finally, the coordinator of the Chapter 1 program for any single facility may also be responsible for statewide program coordination or other functions at the facility level.

Administrative complexity introduced by the sheer number and diversity of involved organizations and individuals is exacerbated by factors specific to the institutional environment: (1) in many facilities education is not the first priority, if it is a priority at all; (2) virtually all inmates are educationally and economically disadvantaged; and (3) students are constantly entering and leaving the program, many of them participating for only a few months at a time. These special circumstances of the Chapter 1 N or D program have profound effects on program administration.

This chapter describes the resources used for program administration and the specific roles and responsibilities of SEAs, SAAs, and facility staff. It deals with the administrative functions of setting eligibility standards, reviewing and approving applications, allocating funds, monitoring and auditing the program, providing technical assistance, and evaluating the program.

In fiscal 1988 SEAs retained less than 1 percent of their total Chapter 1 N or D allocation for program administration, passing on virtually the entire grant amount, averaging $561,473, to SAAs. Seventy-six percent of SEAs used funding from the Chapter 1 set-aside for state administration to support administration of the N or D program, and 14 percent also used state education funds for this purpose.

Although SAAs report that they allocate, on average, approximately four FTEs to the program, this figure probably exaggerates the agencies' administrative efforts, because a few states include facility-level staff as SAA personnel. A more accurate representation of SAA staff allocation to Chapter 1 N or D program administration is that, on average, SAA Chapter 1 coordinators report spending 46 percent of their time on administration of the program.

SAAs report spending 10 percent of their total Chapter 1 N or D allocation for administration. In addition, many SAAs also draw on other sources, such as SAA general funds (49 percent), state education funds (26 percent), and regular Chapter 1 funds (18 percent) to support administrative costs for the program.

The assignment of administrative responsibility at the facility level depends on the structure of corrections education in the state. For example, several states have a single SAA staff person who is responsible for program coordination at all participating facilities under the agency's jurisdiction. In other instances, the facility-level Chapter 1 N or D program coordinator is a staff member at the facility, often the principal or a teacher. Of those persons responsible for administration of the program at the facility level, 77 percent hold another position at the facility. The figure is 87 percent at youth facilities. The positions most frequently held are principal, teacher (other than Chapter 1), educational supervisor or counselor, and Chapter 1 teacher (Table 6-1).

Chapter 1 coordinators at the facility level spend 14 percent, on average, of their time on the Chapter 1 N or D program. Overall, facilities report allocating no Chapter 1-funded FTEs to Chapter 1 N or D program administration; hence compensation for the administration function appears to come from sources other than the Chapter 1 N or D grant. When asked to identify all the persons to whom they report regarding the program, 70 percent of facility coordinators identified SAA officials, while many also named school principals (46 percent), facility superintendents (41 percent), and SEA officials (38 percent). The role of the SAA seems

particularly critical to adult-institution coordinators, 81 percent of whom identified SAA officials (compared with 62 percent of the coordinators in youth facilities). Conversely, program coordinators in youth facilities are more likely to report on the program to facility supervisors (57 percent) than are the coordinators in adult institutions (15 percent).

Table 6-1. Other Facility-Level Positions Currently Held by Chapter 1 N or D Coordinator's by Type of Facility

Position	Percent of Response[a]		
	Youth Facility (n = 204)	Adult Facility (n = 130)	Total (n = 334)
None	13	39	23
Chapter 1 teacher	10	23	15
Regular education teacher	31	10	23
Principal	40	13	29
Assistant principal	9	0	5
Educational supervisor or counselor	13	32	20
Program administrator	19	0	12

SOURCE: Chapter 1 coordinator interviews.

[a] Columns do not add to 100 percent because more than one other position may be held.

So although administrative responsibilities vary across and within states, generally the key administrative role is performed by SAA staff. On average, the coordinators in SAAs spend far more time on Chapter 1 N or D than do the coordinators in SEAs or facilities. Of the total funding allocation to SAAs, 10 percent goes into N or D program administration.

Administrative Operations

Administration of the Chapter 1 N or D program encompasses three broad areas of decision making: (1) determining who receives services and allocating resources; (2) ensuring that

funded programs comply with federal and state regulations; and (3) promoting and measuring program effectiveness.

Who Receives Services. Deciding how to distribute Chapter 1 N or D resources within a state necessitates establishing standards for student eligibility to receive services, completing and processing applications for funding, and allocating available funds to institutions. Typically, individual facilities determine the number of eligible students and their needs and apply to the SAA for Chapter 1 N or D funds. The SAA incorporates information from all facilities in its jurisdiction and applies to the SEA. The SAA receives funding from the SEA and then allocates these monies to participating facilities in accordance with factors it considers paramount.

Student eligibility standards. The minimum requirements for student eligibility to receive Chapter 1 services are those prescribed by federal regulation: the student must be under 21 years old, have no high school diploma, and participate in at least 10 hours per week of regular education instruction. The SEA, the SAA, or the facility itself sometimes impose an additional criterion for eligibility, based on student achievement. The achievement threshold for eligibility is either a number of years below grade level or a score below a certain percentile on a standardized test; the specific grade level and percentile thresholds vary widely across states and institutions.

SEAs and SAAs seldom add achievement criteria to the federal minimum standard. Only 5 SEAs report having articulated an achievement-based criterion for eligibility, whereas 18, or about one-fourth, of SAAs have imposed such a standard. The majority of SAAs simply adopt the SEA standard for eligibility.

The main issue raised by study respondents in the area of eligibility is a desire for more flexibility in regulations, particularly with respect to the federally prescribed age limit of 21 years or under. Easing the age requirement on eligibility was the recommendation for program improvement offered most frequently by the SAA staff. This issue is particularly important in adult institutions, where it was the most frequent recommendation from facility survey respondents as well as from the Chapter 1 coordinators interviewed.

Application review and approval. State applicant agencies typically apply to the SEA for Chapter 1 N or D funding annually. In seven states a formal application is required only every 3 years, with updates in the off years. Similarly, most SAAs receive annual applications from facilities, although 13 SAAs reported that no application was required from facilities.

The content of SAA applications is fairly uniform across states, with project descriptions, budget information, facility descriptions, and needs assessment data nearly always included. In most states, student selection procedures, maintenance of effort data, and evaluation data also are part of the application.

In all but four states SAAs are required to provide assurances to the SEA regarding evaluation, needs assessment, and maintenance of effort, with most SAAs requiring similar assurances from facilities. Assurances are far less likely to be included in the areas of comparability and sustained gains.

Funds allocation. SAAs allocate program funds to facilities on the basis of factors that include the number of eligible residents, the type of education program within the facility, and facility requests in applications. Table 6-2 lists the most important methods of funds allocation from the perspective of SAA staff. It shows that slightly fewer than one-third of all SAAs base their decisions about funds allocation primarily on factors other than the number of eligible students. Underscoring an important difference in program administration between the basic grants Chapter 1 program and the Chapter 1 N or D program, SAAs must consider whether there is an appropriate education program for Chapter 1 to supplement. Nine of the 10 SAAs rating this factor as the most important in allocation decisions have jurisdictions that include juvenile facilities.

Table 6-2. Most Important Method of Funds Allocation, by SAAs

	SAAs Responding	
Method Used	n	%
Number of eligible residents	50	68
Type of education program operating within facilities	10	14
Facility request in application	6	8
Needs assessment	3	4
Number of staff	3	4
Evenly among institutions	1	1
Number of students to be served	1	1
Total	74	100%

SOURCE: Mail Survey of SAAs.

Another difference between the basic grants Chapter 1 program and the Chapter 1 N or D program is that many facilities choose not to participate. More than half of responding SAAs (54 percent) have facilities under their jurisdiction with at least 10 eligible residents that do not participate in the Chapter 1 program, as a result of a decision by either the SAA or the facility staff. Table 6-3 summarizes the reasons for nonparticipation.

Like local education agencies, SAAs must base allocation decisions in part on the size of their budget and on the availability of other compensatory service funding. It is clear from these data that a fundamental reason more facilities do not participate in the Chapter 1 N or D program is a scarcity of resources. Other reasons why some facilities do not participate are perhaps more peculiar to the corrections environment, particularly student turnover and the lack of an educational program altogether.

Finally, one-fifth of all SAAs with nonparticipating facilities report that facilities do not participate because of application or evaluation requirements. This finding suggests a perception that the potential benefit represented by Chapter 1 N or D funding is less than commensurate with the program's administrative burden. This perception is no doubt made easier where other compensatory funding that carries relatively less burden is available.

Table 6-3. Reasons Facilities With Eligible Residents Do Not Participate in the Chapter 1 N or D Program

	SAAs Responding	
	n[a]	%[a]
Not enough funding	18	45
Short-term facility	14	35
Application/evaluation requirements	8	20
Not enough students	7	18
No educational program	4	10
State provides other compensatory education funding	4	10

SOURCE: Mail Survey of SAAs.

[a] Any SAA may have selected more than one response.

Program Compliance. Once programs are funded, the administrative function becomes one of ensuring compliance with federal and state regulations and promoting program improvement. Program compliance is ensured mainly through fiscal audits and program monitoring.

Three-fourths of the states audit the facilities once a year; the remaining states audit facilities in alternate years. A number of different agencies -- including SEAs, SAAs, state audit agencies, and independent contractors -- conduct facility audits. State audit agencies perform this function in about three-fourths of the states, SEAs audit facilities in 13 states, and SAAs in 12.

Both SEAs and SAAs play a much greater role in monitoring than auditing. Virtually every SEA reported monitoring facility programs, and 54 SAAs -- 72 percent -- were reported to conduct on-site monitoring of facility Chapter 1 programs.

Although less universal, SAA monitoring is far more frequent among those agencies that do perform this oversight role, as shown in Table 6-4. Only 10 percent of all facilities were reported to have been monitored more than once a year by SEAs, while 67 percent of all facilities with Chapter 1 programs were monitored at least twice by the SAA. Facility Chapter 1 coordinators confirm that SAAs monitor their programs more often than SEAs.

Table 6-4. Average Percent of Facilities Monitored On Site by SEA and SAA

	Average Percent of Facilities[a]	
	SEA (n = 48)	SAA (n = 52)
Not monitored on site	5	1
Less than once a year	31	4
Once a year	55	29
Twice a year	6	17
Three times a year	2	18
More than three times a year	2	32
Total	101%	101%

SOURCE: Mail Surveys of SEAs and SAAs.

[a] Columns do not add to 100 percent because of rounding.

The program areas most frequently reported by state agencies include: size, scope, and quality; application of eligibility criteria; needs assessment; and evaluation. SAAs said they are somewhat more likely to examine program improvement (83 percent of SAAs, compared with 65 percent of SEAs) and maintenance of effort (70 percent of SAAs; 63 percent of SEAs). Less frequent issues of concern during on-site monitoring include comparability and sustained gains.

Technical Assistance and Evaluation. According to the 47 SEAs that reported having an agreement with a regional Chapter 1 Technical Assistance Center (TAC), the agreements include assistance to state agency staff more often than to facility staff. Whereas 34 SEAs (74 percent) reported TAC assistance to agency staff as part of the agreement, 28 (60 percent) indicated that the TAC provides assistance to facility-level staff.

SAA staff report less frequent assistance from TACs. Forty-seven percent indicated that the TAC provides service to agency staff, and 30 percent responded that the TAC assists the facilities under their jurisdiction. Adult facilities are less likely to receive TAC assistance, with just 19 percent of the SAAs with adult facilities included under their jurisdiction reporting facility-level help from TACs, compared with 42 percent of SAAs responsible for juvenile or neglected facilities only. Facilities are more likely to receive technical assistance directly from SEAs and SAAs.

SEAs and SAAs provided more technical assistance to facilities in completing required reports than in any other area. As indicated in Table 6-5, 86 percent of SEAs and 68 percent of SAAs helped facilities complete the reporting requirements for the Chapter 1 N or D program. This finding is supported by the 30 percent of SAA staff who identified recordkeeping as one of the most important problems in administering the Chapter 1 N or D program (second only to evaluation), and by SEA staff whose most frequent recommendation for program improvement was to ease recordkeeping requirements.

The next most frequent areas of technical assistance are program improvement and evaluation issues. Although not without difficulty in regular public schools, student and program evaluation are markedly more complicated in the correctional environment, as we discuss next.

Federal regulations require that Chapter 1 programs for neglected and delinquent children be "evaluated annually to determine their impact on the ability of such children to maintain and improve educational achievement, to maintain school credit in compliance with state requirements, and to make the transition to a regular program or special education program

operated by a local education agency" (P.L. 100-297, sec. 1212(d)). Table 6-6 indicates the frequency and content of Chapter 1 N or D program evaluations submitted by SAAs to SEAs, and by facilities to SAAs. As the table shows, not all SEAs require annual evaluations from SAAs.

Table 6-5. Technical Assistance Provided by SEAs and SAAs to Facilities

	SEAs (n=51)		SAAs (n=75)	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Completing required reports	44	86	51	68
Improving Chapter 1 N or D projects	39	76	51	68
Setting up evaluation procedures	33	65	43	57
Testing issues	33	65	47	63
Analyzing program evaluation results	28	55	44	59
Selecting program participants	26	51	46	61
Assisting in instructional areas	24	47	49	65
Designing needs assessment	20	39	43	57
Setting up sustained effects procedures	19	37	16	21

SOURCES: Mail Surveys of SEAs and SAAs.

A majority of facilities and SAAs report student achievement scores, yet well below half of these organizations report sustained gains or other participant outcome information to fulfill the stated purposes of the annual evaluation. Of course, the realities of the corrections environment, particularly student turnover, preclude most facilities from systematic collection of participant outcome data that might enable sound analyses of program impact. Moreover, as we have discussed, achievement scores are of dubious validity as a barometer of student progress or program effects.

Table 6-6. Frequency and Content of Chapter 1 N or D Program Evaluations

	SEAs Responding		SAAs Responding	
	n	%	n	%
Frequency of Chapter 1 N or D program evaluation				
Annually	47	92	69	92
Every 2 years	1	2	1	1
Every 3 years	2	4	2	3
Other	1	2	3	4
Total	51	100%	75	100%
Information required in program evaluations				
Unduplicated count of Chapter 1 students	47	92%	65	87%
Number of Chapter 1 students by subject	45	90	56	75
Achievement scores	42	82	62	83
Program description (hours per week, etc.)	41	80	60	80
Number of eligible students under Federal guidelines	35	67	61	81
Number of eligible students under state guidelines	32	63	46	61
Program description (narrative)	24	47	56	75
Sustained gain information	12	24	26	35
Other participant outcomes	4	8	4	5

SOURCES: Mail Surveys of SEAs and SAAs.

We asked Chapter 1 coordinators to identify improvements made as a result of annual program evaluations. More than one-third of the respondents indicated that no improvements had been made. Table 6-7 summarizes the types of specific improvements noted by the remaining 64 percent of Chapter 1 coordinators who could list specific improvements. Overall, new or improved instructional materials and new programs were improvements emanating most

often from program evaluation data. In adult institutions, the improvement reported most frequently was recordkeeping.

Table 6-7. Improvements Made as a Result of the Annual Evaluation, by Type of Facility

Improvement	Percent of Coordinators Responding[a]		
	Youth Facility (n=122)	Adult Facility (n=78)	Total (average) (n=200)
Improved instructional materials/new materials	36	24	32
Developed new program	30	27	29
Improved recordkeeping	14	32	21
Served more students	20	4	14
Improved student assessment	15	12	14
Improved use of Chapter 1 staff	10	0	6
Improved coordination with other education programs	0	4	2

SOURCE: Chapter 1 Coordinator Interviews.

[a] Columns do not add to 100 percent because more than one response was appropriate.

Asked whether they believed the annual evaluation to be a useful measurement of the success of the Chapter 1 program at their facility, 59 percent of coordinators responded that it was not. We asked Chapter 1 coordinators who have the perception that the annual evaluation is not a useful measurement of program impact to indicate their reasons for holding such a view. In adult facilities the reasons most frequently cited are student turnover, unrealistic federal guidelines, and the fact that few students actually take tests. The reasons reported most frequently by Chapter 1 coordinators for youth facilities included a need for bimonthly tests, the difficulty of improving student achievement generally, and a belief that pre- and post-testing are simply not valid. So while specific responses differ in broad terms by time of facility, it is clear that the central problem with program evaluation requirements across all Chapter 1 N or D facilities, as perceived by program coordinators, is a lack of fit between existing requirements and the special nature of the institutionalized student population (e.g., short-term, nonroutinized involvement).

Summary of Program Administration

Administration of the Chapter 1 N or D program is complicated by the diversity of organizational structures and associated missions of the involved parties. SEAs, more concerned with the basic Chapter 1 program, allocate few resources to the N or D program. The primary SEA role is to act as a funding conduit between the federal government and SAAs, and the functions it performs are those associated with such a role: application review and approval and relatively infrequent on-site technical assistance and program monitoring.

Facility-level staff, responsible for day-to-day program administration, typically hold other positions at the facility and, like SEA staff, devote little time to the Chapter 1 N or D program. The primary function of program coordinators at the facility level is to implement the policies dictated by the SAA.

State applicant agencies serve the key administrative role in the program, with responsibility for developing programs, allocating funds to institutions, conducting regular on-site monitoring, providing technical assistance, and generally overseeing program operations. Yet, although SAA program coordinators spend over twice as much of their time on program administration as do their SEA or facility counterparts do, they frequently have other, more fundamental responsibilities, either in education or corrections. On average, they allocate less than half their time to the program.

Within this diverse and overlapping administrative structure, where it is rare that any single person's time is devoted exclusively, or even primarily, to the Chapter 1 N or D program, operates a program with a voluminous regulatory structure that was established and has evolved primarily in noncorrectional environments. The result is a perceived lack of balance between the potential impact represented by Chapter 1 resources and the administrative burden inherited by the recipients of these resources--the burden resulting from the requirements themselves and from the inappropriateness of many of these requirements in the particular environment in which the Chapter 1 N or D program operates.

Table 6-8, which presents the most important problems in administering the Chapter 1 program, as identified by SEA and SAA staff, underscores this lack of balance. For SEAs the single biggest problem is the lack of congruence between Chapter 1 N or D and the basic grants Chapter 1 program and the lack of coordination between themselves, SAAs, and facilities. For

SAAs, evaluation issues, recordkeeping, and student turnover are the largest problems. Implications of these and other study findings are discussed in the next chapter.

Table 6-8. Most Important Problems in Administering the Chapter 1 N or D Program

	Number of SEAs (n=41)	Percent of SAAs (n=69)	Percent of Facilities (n=323)
Lack of congruence between Chapter 1 N or D and basic grants Chapter 1	44	14	
Lack of interagency coordination	17	10	0
Lack of congruence with regular programs	0	5	26
Small projects, geographic dispersion of eligible students	15	7	6
Recordkeeping, paperwork	15	30	17
Student turnover	12	19	21
Student eligibility and selection	10	3	3
Ensuring supplement not supplant	7	4	11
Education regulations unclear	7	10	7
Low priority on education	7	16	4
Inadequate funding	5	19	24
Staff hiring	5	3	11
Age limits on eligibles	5	10	6
Facility staff ignorance of regulations	2	0	12
Securing appropriate materials	2	0	10
Evaluation issues	0	32	14
Fiscal management	0	16	3
Staff training	0	7	7

SOURCES: Mail Surveys of SEAs, SAAs, and facilities.

7. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

Chapter 1-eligible youth in state-operated correctional institutions are predominantly male and likely to have come from broken homes. At the time of commitment, these youth are typically unemployed and have, on average, completed 8 years of formal schooling. A majority of these youth have had some prior involvement with the criminal justice system.

Approximately half of the eligible population in participating facilities participates in the Chapter 1 N or D program. One of the purposes of the descriptive study was to identify key differences between the characteristics of Chapter 1 N or D participants and eligible non-participants -- and then to describe how the Chapter 1 N or D program differed from the regular education program. We have found that significant differences among incarcerated youth, and in the educational services they receive, are associated much more strongly with type of institution than with participation in the Chapter 1 N or D program. In other words, Chapter 1 students in youth facilities resemble eligible but nonparticipating students in youth facilities more closely than they resemble Chapter 1 students in adult facilities.

Chapter 1 N or D participants in facilities for delinquent youth -- the majority of N o D program participants -- are generally younger than participants in adult facilities, more likely to have been in school at the time of commitment, and more likely to plan to return to school after release. Chapter 1 N or D students in adult institutions are more likely to have worked at some point prior to commitment. Adult facility students are also more likely to plan not to return to school or to return to a vocational, technical, or business school than are Chapter 1 N or D students in youth facilities, more than half of whom plan to return to high school.

The disadvantaged backgrounds of most students eligible for Chapter 1 N or D present a formidable challenge to educators who work in an environment where education is, by definition, not paramount. The attention accorded to education in institutions is strained further by the overcrowded conditions that plague many state-operated institutions; overcrowding draws resources away from education to fulfill the primary purposes of confinement and security. Overall, education expenditures represent about 8 percent of the total facility budget--15 percent

resources away from education to fulfill the primary purposes of confinement and security. Overall, education expenditures represent about 8 percent of the total facility budget--15 percent in youth facilities and 5 percent in adult institutions.

Although the priority given to education is an important issue in all institutions, it is less of a concern in youth facilities, where participation in education is typically mandatory for all residents. Whereas 87 percent of all youth facility residents are engaged in an education program, only one-third of those in adult facilities participate in education. Organizationally, the typical youth facility tends to resemble a campus or an educationally oriented organization much more than does the typical adult institution.

Given the students' background and the challenges they will face after release, the goals of education programs in institutions, regardless of type, tend to be more broadly stated than those of public schools. Their goals are more often pragmatic, such as GED and vocational preparation in addition to basic skills improvement. Because the students in youth facilities are younger and more likely to reenter the public schools, education programs there also tend to focus on improving student attitudes toward learning and themselves. In adult institutions vocational programs are the most heavily attended, while high school classes and basic skills instruction attract the most students in youth facilities. Chapter 1 teachers at both types of facilities, however, perceive student attitude to be critical to individual success; 93 percent of these teachers identify improving the student's self-concept as a learner as particularly important.

Regardless of focus, the crucial factor in the success of an education program in a correctional institution, as evidenced by the recommendations offered by school principals for its improvement, is the priority assigned to the education function. Principals want more dedication on the part of the facility staff and a larger share of resources for education. The recommendations provided, in order of frequency, include more funding, greater teacher and administrator commitment, more programs, more classroom space, and more computers.

Within the correctional environment, facility coordinators perceive the role of the Chapter 1 program to be essentially the same as in the public school system--to provide supplemental instruction to low achieving students. Although Chapter 1 N or D funds support a wide range of academic and other services, the three most widely available Chapter 1 classes are reading, mathematics, and language arts. Half of all Chapter 1 teachers provide instruction in Chapter 1 reading and 40 percent in Chapter 1 math. On average, Chapter 1 N or D reading and math participants attend these classes for 5 hours per week, 45 weeks per year.

Other programs supported by Chapter 1 N or D funds include study skills courses, counseling, and life skills instruction. Nearly one-third of all Chapter 1 teachers provide instruction in social and life skills. Transitional services are supported by Chapter 1 N or D in 11 percent of participating facilities.

The supplemental function of Chapter 1 N or D is particularly manifest in the areas of classroom aides, computers and computer-related instruction, and in-service training of instructional staff. The proportion of Chapter 1 N or D funds used to support each of these education resources is markedly higher than the proportion of other education funding. On average, Chapter 1 N or D provides about 10 percent of a facility's education budget and about 12 percent of its education staff. The proportion of total education funding and staffing represented by Chapter 1 N or D is about twice as high in youth facilities as in adult facilities, consistent with the higher level of participation at youth facilities. Fifty-three percent of all regular education students receive Chapter 1 N or D services in juvenile facilities, compared with just 10 percent of those in adult institutions.

By any measure, the Chapter 1 N or D program is concentrated in facilities for delinquent youth. Such facilities are more likely to operate a Chapter 1 program, and, on a given day, they house 60 percent of the eligible population and 67 percent of all Chapter 1 N or D students. Also, the average size of the Chapter 1 program in youth facilities is nearly double that found in adult facilities. Finally, Chapter 1 programs in youth facilities serve 59 percent of eligible students, whereas those in adult institutions serve only 36 percent.

According to facility coordinators in youth facilities, more eligible students would receive services if more funding and more classroom space were available. In adult facilities, the primary reasons cited for the relatively low level of participation among eligible students are factors related to the students themselves, such as an unwillingness to participate and behavioral

problems that preclude participation. Schedule conflicts with work activities were also cited by a majority of Chapter 1 N or D program coordinators at adult facilities as a reason why more eligible students do not receive their program services.

In adult facilities, the amount of resources contributed by Chapter 1 N or D is, on average, just enough to compensate a single teacher. A majority of Chapter 1 teachers in adult facilities are responsible for providing all the students' academic as well as Chapter 1 instruction. The result in such facilities is that Chapter 1 N or D is difficult to distinguish as a separate program entity in the school or classroom, retaining its distinctiveness largely as a funding source and as an administrative concern.

Chapter 1 teachers in participating facilities are nearly always full-time staff, and virtually all are state certified. These teachers have an average of 15 years of teaching experience -- 6 years of Chapter 1 instruction and 7 years of instruction at their present facility. Seventy percent of these teachers, if given a choice of settings in which to teach, would continue to work in their present facility.

On average, Chapter 1 N or D teachers and regular teachers have five classes per day. Nearly 70 percent of Chapter 1 teacher time is devoted to classroom instruction, of which 70 percent is devoted to academic interaction. Workbooks are the most frequently used materials in the Chapter 1 classroom, and computers are perceived to be the greatest need.

Administration of the Chapter 1 N or D program is complicated by the number and diversity of responsible agencies and by the fact that most persons with administrative responsibility for the Chapter 1 N or D program have other, equally or more pressing concerns. On average, SEA Chapter 1 N or D coordinators allocate just 19 percent of their time to the program, facility-level coordinators 14 percent, and SAA Chapter 1 N or D coordinators 46 percent.

SEAs act primarily as flow-through agencies for funding between the federal government and SAAs, having responsibility for application review and approval and carrying out relatively less frequent monitoring and technical assistance at the facilities than do SAAs. Facility Chapter 1 N or D coordinators, who typically hold other facility-level positions, are responsible for implementing SAA policy at the facility. SAAs are the primary administrative agent for the program and are responsible for developing programs, allocating funds to institutions, conducting

regular on-site monitoring, providing technical assistance, and generally overseeing program operations.

Complexity in the administration of the Chapter 1 N or D program derives not only from the diversity of involved organizations and the secondary priority often accorded to the program by the responsible individuals, but also from the nature of the corrections environment itself. Characteristics of the corrections environment, such as the small number of eligible students and high student turnover, render certain administrative requirements more difficult to fulfill than in the public school system.

Some 53 percent of all SAAs report that some facilities do not operate a Chapter 1 N or D program. The most frequent reasons that they report for nonparticipation among facilities housing at least 10 eligible students are not enough funding, short-term facility, application/evaluation requirements, and not enough students. Thus some facilities do not participate because of administrative features of the Chapter 1 N or D program, such as the amount of available funds and the administrative burden associated with participation; and some do not participate because of their own characteristics, such as the length of time students will be in the facility (affecting the potential for student benefit) and the number of eligible students.

Requirements regarding Chapter 1 N or D program evaluation appear to be a particularly problematic aspect of program administration. Fifty-nine percent of facility coordinators report that annual program evaluations are not a useful measure of program success. The most frequent reason provided by those holding this view is that federal evaluation guidelines are not realistic in the corrections environment. Other reasons cited provide more specific examples of the problems in corrections education, including student turnover, the fact that few students take tests, and the belief that pre- and post-testing in the corrections environment is simply not valid.

Finally, a summary of the biggest problems in the administration and implementation of the Chapter 1 N or D program, as identified by the administrative agents of the program, reflects a widespread perception that current administrative structures and requirements do not fit well in the corrections environment and are unduly burdensome. For SEA program coordinators, the biggest problems in administering the program are the lack of congruence among Chapter 1 N or D and the basic grants Chapter 1 program and the lack of coordination among themselves, SAAs, and facilities. For SAAs, evaluation issues, recordkeeping, and inadequate funding are the

largest problems. For facility education program administrators, lack of congruence with the regular education program, inadequate funding, and student turnover are the most important problems in administering the program.

In sum, although it is clear that the Chapter 1 N or D program provides valuable resources to help a population in dire need of compensatory services, its current operational status, as perceived by practitioners, is somewhat problematic. Among the most significant perceived problems are the complexity of the administrative structures and requirements, the inadequacy of current funding levels, and the low proportion of eligible students served in adult facilities.

With respect to the issue of administrative structures for corrections education, researchers have proposed the use of a school district model, now in place in nine states, because it offers improved autonomy, control, and status to the education function in state adult correctional systems (Coffey, 1986). As these same researchers point out, however, the effectiveness of this model has yet to be fully documented. In any event, implementation of this, or any other state-level administrative model, is beyond the purview of the Education Department.

On the issue of administrative burden, the recent renewed interest in schoolwide Chapter 1 projects in the public schools may hold some relevance for the Chapter 1 N or D program. Conceptually, the reasoning behind this renewed interest as expressed in congressional reports--"to eliminate unnecessary administrative burden and paperwork and overly prescriptive regulations"-- is at least as applicable to youth institutions as to public schools. Given that the vast majority of institutionalized youths are both economically and educationally disadvantaged, a more general form of compensatory education aid seems appropriate. Of course, in light of the special circumstances of the Chapter 1 N or D program, measures of accountability different from those proposed for schools may need to be developed.

With respect to the issue of funding, the ideal, from the practitioner perspective, would be to increase the total amount appropriated to the Chapter 1 N or D program. In light of the current federal budget situation and the fact that the Chapter 1 N or D program has been level-funded for the past 6 years, significant increases seem unlikely. Hence, the issue becomes one of allocation of relatively static resources.

Because the most frequently reported reasons for nonparticipation among eligible students in adult institutions are student refusal and inappropriate student behavior, providing additional Chapter 1 N or D resources to such facilities might appear to be less than prudent from a federal policy perspective. From a facility perspective, however, the issue is not why more eligible students are not served, but rather, why more students are not eligible.

In adult facilities, which house about one-third of the eligible population and one-quarter of those served, expansion rests on either raising the age limit for eligibility or making participation less subject to the discretion of those currently eligible. Although raising the age limit on eligibility -- the most frequent recommendation offered for program improvement by Chapter 1 N or D coordinators at adult institutions -- is logical from the perspective of those educators, such action is inconsistent with the fundamental purpose of Chapter 1--to assist children--and is not the sort of change Congress is likely to embrace. And again, mandating participation in Chapter 1 N or D by adults is not an option available to the federal government.

Currently, the program is concentrated primarily in facilities for delinquent youth, and expansion of the program to serve more students in such facilities depends largely on the availability of more funds. Increased funding is the most frequent recommendation offered by program coordinators at youth facilities. To accommodate this recommendation, assuming level funding continues, the Chapter 1 N or D program would have to concentrate a greater portion of available resources on youth facilities, that is, where education is largely mandatory, nearly everyone is under 21 years of age, and a majority of students plan to return to schools. The data indicate that although the need for compensatory services may well be as great in adult institutions as in youth facilities, if not greater, Chapter 1, as a highly targeted and regulated program, may not be the most appropriate vehicle for delivering such services. Nevertheless, although fewer students are served in adult facilities, Chapter 1 N or D provides a relatively greater contribution to the overall education of those who are served, at least as measured by the amount of resources expended per student.

APPENDIX A

Procedures for the Descriptive Study and Baseline Longitudinal Study Components of the Study of Chapter 1 Neglected or Delinquent Programs

APPENDIX A

Procedures for the Descriptive Study and Baseline Longitudinal Study Components of the Study of Chapter 1 Neglected or Delinquent Programs

Introduction and Overview

The Study of Chapter 1 Neglected or Delinquent Programs was conducted by Westat, Inc.; Policy Studies Associates, Inc.; and Research & Training Associates. State education agencies (SEAs) and state applicant agencies (SAAs) in the 50 states and District of Columbia were all included in the study. A sample of 120 facilities receiving Chapter 1 N or D funds as of autumn 1988 was drawn, as well as samples of Chapter 1 administrators, teachers, regular education program teachers, Chapter 1 N or D participating students, and eligible nonparticipating students at a subsample of 40 facilities.

Questionnaires were mailed to SEAs and SAAs in November 1988 and to sampled facilities in January 1989. The final responses were received in July 1989, although most agencies had responded by April. Site visits were conducted from March through May 1989 to 38 of 40 subsampled facilities found to be eligible.

Following data collection, each questionnaire was reviewed and coded, and the data were entered into a computer file. All responses were checked for appropriate range and internal consistency. The nine descriptive study data files were edited and formatted for data analysis over a 4-month period from April through July.

Sampling weights were calculated for the data files derived from samples and appended to the data files for analysis. This process is discussed in the next section of this appendix. Data analysis consisted of frequency distributions and cross-tabulations, means, and medians. Data were presented for the all state education agencies, all state applicant agencies, for the overall population of state-operated facilities participating in Chapter 1 N or D and for facilities operated by states' adult and juvenile justice systems, for staff in all types of facilities and in the two categories of facilities, for Chapter 1 students overall and in the two types of facilities, and for eligible non-participants overall and in the two types of facilities. Preliminary tabulations with no analytic text were produced in June and July 1989.

Sample Design and Weighting Coefficients

Sampling Frame and Facilities

The sampling frame on facilities was compiled from verified listings of facilities receiving Chapter 1 Neglected or Delinquent (N or D) funds provided by state Chapter 1 directors. Letters requesting updated listings and updated information were mailed to 50 states and District of Columbia in August 1988. In addition to name and location of each facility, state directors were asked to provide information on the number of Chapter 1 participants receiving services on or about May 15, 1988; the number of residents in each facility on that date; the facility's average length of stay; and the type of facility -- adult correctional facility, a facility for juvenile delinquents, or for neglected youth. The final updated information was received in December 1988. Information from the updated lists was entered in a database and the database reviewed and edited against source documents for accuracy. State personnel were called for additional information or clarification where information appeared to not adhere to the study definitions. The complete frame of state-operated facilities receiving Chapter 1 N or D funds contained 437 institutions.

Selection of the Samples

Sample of 120 Facilities. The sample of 120 state-operated facilities with Chapter 1 N or D programs was drawn from a population file compiled from the updated lists of facilities provided by state Chapter 1 directors. States were instructed to include facilities operated directly by the state and to include programs offered to students at correctional, delinquent, or neglected facilities operated by the state. Facilities with multiple campuses were to be listed according to the unit or units operating the Chapter 1 program. Programs reported to have fewer than 11 participants and programs serving neglected youth were excluded from the facility-level portion of the study and were ineligible for selection.

The variables listed below were identified as important for control of the sample and were used for sorting. Table A-1 gives frequencies of these variables after cleaning.

- Region as defined by the Census Bureau.
- Average length of stay; two categories were used: (1) less than 6 months and (2) everything else.
- Size of facility (using the average daily population of the correctional facility); two categories were used: (1) 230 or fewer and (2) everything else.
- Type of facility: juvenile or adult.

In addition, a measure of size was assigned to every institution as the square root of the number of Chapter 1 participants. Seven institutions had such large numbers of participants that they were selected with certainty. The remaining 360 institutions were sorted by type of facility, the two categories of facility size, the two categories of average length of stay, region, and number of Chapter 1 participants. A systematic probability sample of 120 institutions was selected with the indicated measure of size and sort. The sample consisted of 49 adult facilities and 71 juvenile facilities.

Subsample and 40 Facilities. Of the 120, a subsample of 40 institutions was selected for site visits. Two of the 120 were selected with certainty for the sample of 40 because they were reported to have large number of Chapter 1 students. Both were adult facilities. The remaining 15 adult facilities and 23 juvenile facilities were selected with qui-probability systematic selection within each type of facility using the same sort as was used to select the sample of 120.

Anticipating that not every subsampled facility would participate, a "ghost" or substitute unit was selected for each of the 38 facilities that had not been selected with certainty. This unit was either the immediately preceding institution in the sort or the immediately following. Substitutes were alternately selected from the two possible positions so that they would not be systematically smaller than (or larger than) the principal sampled units. Substitution was not preferred, but provided as a fall-back option. Two substitutions were made. They consisted of #308 for #208 and #330 for #230.

Table A-1. Frequencies on Stratifying Variables

Census Region

Region	Frequency	Percent
1. Northeast	99	27.0
2. Midwest	79	21.5
3. South	113	30.8
4. West	76	20.7

Length-of-Stay Class

LOS	Frequency	Percent
1. Less than 6 months	80	21.8
2. All others	287	78.2

Type of Facility

Type	Frequency	Percent
A. Adult	146	39.8
J. Juvenile	221	60.2

Size of Facility

Type	Frequency	Percent
1. 230 or less Automated Data Processing	212	57.8
2. All others	155	42.2

Teachers Within the 40 Facilities. Each facility was requested to provide the names of all teachers teaching Chapter 1 N or D at the time of the site visit and all regular education program teachers who did not have Chapter 1 teacher assignments but did teach Chapter 1 students or students who were eligible for Chapter 1. Site visitors were provided written instructions, sampling worksheets, and randomly assigned start numbers to use to select teachers.

Chapter 1 N or D and regular education program teachers were selected independently. If there were three or fewer Chapter 1 N or D teachers, they were selected with certainty. If there were more than three Chapter 1 N or D teachers, two were selected using a random start and selected interval proportionate to the number of Chapter 1 N or D teachers at the facility. Two regular education program teachers were also selected at each site. Worksheets provided formulas for calculating the site-specific sampling interval in accordance with the number of regular education program teachers on the sample frame. Site visitors were provided with preassigned random start numbers to use at each facility.

Students Within the 40 Facilities. The liaison person for each facility to be visited was requested to provide two lists of students to the team leader prior to the site visit:

1. Chapter 1 N or D participants: All student who were enrolled in and receiving Chapter 1 N or D services as of the date the list was prepared; and

2. Eligible nonparticipants: All students who were not enrolled in Chapter 1 but who were enrolled in an education program for 10 or more hours a week, who did not have a high school diploma or its equivalent, and who were under 21 as of the date the list was prepared.

Some facilities requested that the sample be selected before the site visit team arrived. In all other cases, team leaders selected the sample while on site after verifying that the list was up-to-date by removing students no longer at the facility or no longer participating in the programs for which they were selected.

Team leaders used sample worksheets to select the students for each sample. The number of students of each type to be selected was predesignated by the statistician in order to obtain target sample sizes of 800 Chapter 1 participants and 320 eligible nonparticipants. Team leaders were given the target sample size, the sampling interval, and random start numbers for each site. The worksheet contained instructions for adjusting sampling intervals to accommodate attrition due to turnover or other losses. If predesignated adjustment fractions did not produce sample sizes within specified ranges, new adjustment fractions were obtained by calling the central office for instructions.

Completed worksheets were submitted to the central office as a quality check on the sampling procedures.

Estimation

A weight has been added to each of the records in each of the files. This weight reflects the number of students, teachers, administrators, or facilities represented by the sample case. Unbiased estimates of population totals are obtained by summing the weights of all cases with the relevant characteristics.

Weights for the file of 120 facilities. The base weight for each institution is just the inverse probability of selection. Let P_{120i} be the probability of selection for the ith facility. The baseweight is then:

$$BW_{120i} = 1/P_{120i}.$$

Of the 120, 13 did not respond. Two of the 13 were ineligible. The base weights were adjusted to compensate for the 11 eligible nonrespondents. Within the adult and juvenile categories, the sum of the base weight was calculated across all eligible cases and across just responding cases. For each age category, the ratio of the two sums (eligible over responding) was formed. Each institution's base weight was multiplied by the ratio for the appropriate adult/juvenile category. The product is the final weight.

$$FW_{120i} = \frac{(BW_{120i}) \; x \; \sum_j BW(\text{where jth unit is eligible})}{\sum_j BW(\text{where jth unit is eligible/responding})}$$

Weights for the education program administrator's (EPA) file. Again, the base weight for each institution is just the inverse probability of selection. Let P_{40i} be the probability of selection for the smaller sample given that the unit was selected for the sample of 120. The overall probability of selection is then $P_{120i}P_{40i}$. Thus the base weight for principals is

$$BW_{EPAi} = BW_{120i}/P_{40i}.$$

For the two institutions that were substituted, the probability of selection for the original institution was used to weight its substitute. Every principal responded, so there was no

need to adjust the base weights for nonresponse. Thus the final weight is equal to the base weight. Note that there are two institutions at which the Chapter 1 programs had been ended. These were thus ineligible and received zero weights.

Weights for the Chapter 1 Coordinator file. Since there is just one coordinator per institution, the base weight for the institution's coordinator is equal to the base weight for the principal. One coordinator did fail to respond. The weights of cases #225 and #224 were multiplied by 1.5 to compensate for nonresponse at #226.

Weights for the student questionnaire file. The weights were built on top of the EPA weights. However, one facility declined to allow students to respond to the questionnaire. Thus for the purposes of computing student questionnaire weights, a new weight, $TW_{EPA,i}$, was created for principals by multiplying the base weights from #220 and #223 by 1.5 to compensate for the nonresponse at #222.

The base weight for each student was obtained by dividing the principal's weight by the probability of selection for the student given that the facility had been selected. As described earlier, this probability was different for Chapter 1 participants than for nonparticipants. Let $P_{S,ij}$ be this probability for the jth student in the ith facility. The student questionnaire base weight is

$$BW_{S,ij} = TW_{EPA,i}/P_{S,ij}.$$

Not all students responded, even within cooperating facilities. The student base weight was divided by the response rate to get the final weight. (The response rate was calculated only among eligible students. Many students were found to be ineligible at the time of questionnaire administration.) Let $R_{S,ij}$ be the response rate among students at the ith facility with the same Chapter 1 status as student j. Then the final student weight is

$$FW_{S,ij} = BW_{S,ij}/R_{S,ij}.$$

Weights for the student abstract file. Every facility with a Chapter 1 program allowed access to student records. Thus the base weight for the abstracts is built directly from the principal's base weight, rather than from the adjusted EPA weights used for the student questionnaires. The base weight was

$$BW_{A,ij} = BW_{EPA,i} / P_{S,ij} .$$

Some abstracts could not be located. Response rates were, in general, different from the response rates for the questionnaire. The final abstract weight was calculated by dividing the base weight by the response rate within the facility and participant class:

$$FW_{A,ij} = BW_{A,ij} / R_{A,ij} .$$

Weights for the file of Chapter 1 teachers. At least one interview with a Chapter 1 teacher was obtained at every facility with a Chapter 1 program. The final weight was taken to be the principal's weight divided by the proportion of Chapter 1 teachers that were interviewed. Thus the final weight for Chapter 1 teachers is

$$FW_{1T,ij} = BW_{EPA,i} / (P_{1T,i} x R_{1T,i}) .$$

Weights for the file of regular teachers. At one facility, no interviews were obtained with regular teachers. It was thus necessary to adjust the principal's weights before using them to build weights for the regular teachers. The weight at facility #214 was multiplied by 4 to account for the total nonresponse at facility #215. Let $TW_{EPA,i}$ be this temporary weight. The final weight for regular teachers was obtained by dividing this temporary principal's weight by the proportion of regular teachers that were interviewed:

$$FW_{RT,ij} = TW_{EPA,i} / (P_{RT,i} x R_{RT,i}) .$$

Survey Questionnaires

Copies of the survey questionnaires are provided in Appendix C. They include:

- Survey of State Education Agencies;
- Survey of State Applicant Agencies;
- Survey of State-operated Delinquent Youth and Adult Correctional Facilities;

- Chapter 1 Teacher Questionnaire;
- Regular Education Program Teacher Questionnaire; and
- Survey of Students in State-operated Facilities with Chapter 1 N or D Programs.

Data Collection and Response Statistics

Preparation for the state-level mail surveys began with the development of a survey universe of participating SAAs. Telephone calls were placed to Chapter 1 N or D coordinators in SEAs in the 50 states and the District of Columbia in order to identify current SAAs and to determine the SEA-preferred procedures for conducting the state-level surveys. Initially, 82 SAAs were identified, with the final number confirmed as 80 at the time of the survey. A survey management database was developed that included names and mailing addresses with indication of whether the SEA wished to coordinate all data collection or if mailings should go directly to SAA-level Chapter 1 N or D coordinators. Twenty-six SEAs coordinated all data collection for their states.

The protocols established during state-level data collection formed the basis of the protocols for the mail survey of facilities and the recruitment of subsampled facilities for site visits.

Mailout of the Questionnaires and Nonresponse Conversion

Survey of State Education Agencies questionnaires and Survey of State Applicant Agency questionnaires were mailed mid-November 1988 with a mid-December due date. Several cycles of reminder letters, second-request mailings, and telephone calls were made to nonresponding SEAs and SAAs monthly beginning in December and continuing through March 1989. Data collection was closed out in mid-July 1989 after the 51st SEA had submitted its response.

The design of the study -- that is, a survey of SEAs and a survey of SAAs -- presented unique problems to three states where the SEA performs Chapter 1 administrative functions on

behalf of the SAA. The SEA Chapter 1 N or D Coordinators in those states were asked to answer the questions supplicated across the two questionnaires only once. Complete forms were compiled during coding for the SEA and the SAA data files based on information from the SEA.

Questionnaires for the Survey of State-operated Delinquent Youth and Adult Correctional Facilities were mailed to the cognizant SEAs or SAAs for distribution to the 120 sampled facilities. In the case of SEAs that had designated the SAA as study liaison, information copies of the letter identifying all sampled facilities in the state were mailed to the Chapter 1 director. Cover materials indicated the facilities selected for the mail survey and the facilities subsampled for site visits. The cover materials also included assurances of confidentiality for participating facilities and individuals. These packages were mailed on January 30, 1989, with a March 1 due date. Several cycles of reminder mailings and telephone calls were made to SEAs and SAAs on behalf of nonresponding facilities through mid-April, 1989. Data collection for the mail survey of facilities were closed out on April 28, 1989.

Recruiting Facilities for Site Visits

The mail survey packages sent to the 40 subsampled facilities included notification that they would be requested to participate in site visits. The mail survey revealed that 2 of the 40 subsampled facilities no longer operated Chapter 1 N or D programs and thus were ineligible for site visits.

Recruitment of the subsampled facilities and planning for site visits began in February and were completed in March. The designated contact (i.e., the SEA or SAA representative) was called in order to determine how to proceed with recruitment. One SEA took the lead in contacting the selected facility and making initial arrangements. In the case of 29 facilities, the SAA functioned in this way; the remaining 7 instances, project staff contacted the facility after receiving state-level approval and set up the visit directly. Letters were mailed to each contact person confirming the agreed-upon protocols and indicating which company would have lead responsibility for the site visit.

State requirements regarding access to youth and permission to conduct research in the state were identified and satisfied during the recruitment phase. State regulations prevented

project staff from gaining access to sampled youth for interviewing at only 1 of the 38 facilities. At all other sites it was possible to satisfy state regulations prior to data collection. At several facilities where the students' written authorization was required in order to access records, this requirement was met during the course of the site visits.

Site-Visit Set-Up Logs were used to maintain records of all telephone contacts and written correspondence. After initial contact and confirmation of willingness to participate, the set-up functions and all documentation were transferred to the cognizant site-visit team leader.

Site Visitor Training and On-site Data Collection

A 1-day training session was held in Rockville, Maryland on March 13, 1989. The training session was attended by all team leaders and a majority of those team members who would assist while on site. Each team member received a written manual documenting study procedures and the study instruments. These manuals provided the basis for the training session and for home study by the site visitors; they remained available as reference documents if issues arose while on site.

The training included a review of --

- The background and purpose of the study, including an explanation of the requirements for maintaining confidentiality;
- The status of planning for site visits and final arrangements;
- The procedures to be followed while on site;
- Student and teacher sampling procedures;
- All data collection instruments; and
- The requirements for data management and control.

After the training session, team leaders trained assistants who did not attend group training. After this training, all team members were well prepared to conduct the site visits. Two-person teams visited the subsampled facilities during March (5 sites), April (16 sites), and May (17 sites) 1989. Lists of eligible students and teachers were provided before the site visit.

When the facility staff preferred it, the samples of students and teachers were selected immediately prior to the site visit or upon arrival. In cases where sampling quotas could not be met because of student turnover or inaccurate information in the sampling frame, the team leaders contacted central office staff for instructions.

Site visitors interviewed principals (education program administrator) and the person most knowledgeable of the facility's operation of Chapter 1 N or D (Chapter 1 coordinator). Chapter 1 teachers and a sample of regular education program teachers completed self-administered questionnaires. Sampled Chapter 1 students and sampled eligible nonparticipants completed a questionnaire administered in a classroom setting. Questionnaires completed by Chapter 1 N or D students provided baseline data for the longitudinal component of the study as well as data for the descriptive study. Data were abstracted from academic and correctional records for these same students. Student nonresponse resulted from students' being inaccessible to site visitors during the time of site visit and individuals' refusals to complete questionnaires. Abstract nonresponse resulted from the refusal of individual students to authorize site visitors access to their records where these were the terms of data collection, as well as from the inability to find records.

Data Retrieval on Key Items

Telephone data retrieval was performed for the three mail surveys. Cases that did not pass coding review were referred to professional staff for review and possible data retrieval with the appropriate respondent. Additional data retrieval was performed to verify or correct problems identified through reviews of frequencies and ratios. Approximately one-half of the state-level respondents and one-quarter of the facility-level respondents were called during processing to verify or correct information contained on their completed survey forms.

Response Statistics

Response rates to each of the data collection efforts are provided in Table A-2.

Table A-2. Results of Field Data Collection

	Percent
State education agencies	51
Responded	51
Response rate	100.0
State applicant agencies	80
Responded	75
Response rate	93.8
Facilities sampled for mail survey	120
Program closed	2
Responded	106
Response rate	89.8
Facilities selected for on-site data collection	40
Program closed	2
Sites visited	38
Number of Chapter 1 teachers at 38 sites	71
Sampled	65
Responded	65
Response rate	100.0
Regular education program teachers at 38 sites	550
Sampled	73
Responded	69
Response rate	94.5
Chapter 1 students	
Available for selection spring 1989	2,169
Sampled	728
Ineligible	58
Completed questionnaire	585
Questionnaire response rate	87.3
Case record data provided	605
Case record response rate	90.3
Non-Chapter 1 Students	
Available for selection spring 1989	1,855
Sampled	293
Ineligible	50
Completed questionnaire	212
Questionnaire response rate	87.2
Case record data provided	208
Case record response rate	85.6

Data Preparation

Before the information was incorporated into the database for analyses, questionnaires were subjected to the following procedures:

- Receipt and scan edit;
- Manual coding and editing;
- Data retrieval, as appropriate; and
- Machine editing.

The following paragraphs describe each of these procedures.

Receipt Control

A dBASE data file was developed to manage the mail surveys of state agencies and facilities. This file contained the name and location of each unit in the survey, information regarding the protocol for contacting respondents in each state, the date the questionnaires were mailed to each type of respondent, the data questionnaires were received, and comments. Summary reports of response status were generated at the end of each month indicating the number of questionnaires mailed to each of the three categories of respondent in each state and the number in each category still outstanding.

Similar data control procedures were used for the materials required by and gathered during each site visit. A Materials Transmittal form was used to record the number of each type of data collection instrument to be expected for a site and the number transmitted to the central office. Upon receipt, the materials were checked against the form and team leaders contacted to resolve discrepancies. Student questionnaires were processed to remove contact information to be used in the longitudinal study and other identifying information from the documents before further processing. This followup information was kept in locked cabinets separate from other study materials. After reviewing Student Control Logs against the Transmittal Form, completed questionnaires, and abstracts, the logs were separated from other materials and kept in locked cabinets.

Codebooks

Codebooks were developed corresponding to the nine questionnaires. These documents, which served as the primary guides throughout the coding process, contained the following information:

- All questions on the instruments and question-by-question descriptions of allowable responses,
- Allowable ranges for all open-ended questions involving numerical data,
- Skip instructions,
- Record layout information,
- Special coding information, and
- Checks for consistency between items and other special coding instructions.

Manual Edit, Coding, and Data Retrieval

Following specifications detailed in the codebooks, a staff of coders performed a manual edit for each instrument. Questionnaires were checked for item nonresponse, question-by-question consistency, and compliance with skip instructions. Cases with problems were flagged for senior staff review and possible data retrieval. Responses for nonnumeric open-ended items were then coded. For those with extensive response, a log of responses were maintained, reviewed, analyzed, and grouped by senior staff, and codes were developed. For those with limited instance of response, codes were assigned and records kept as cases were processed.

Decisions about coding were made only by the coding supervisor, project director, and descriptive study manager. Records were kept in the hard-copy survey forms of all decisions and changes and the results of all data retrieval.

Data Entry and Machine Edits

Once questionnaires were edited and coded, they were sent to the data-entry department for keying. One hundred percent verification was performed on all keying. Questionnaires were sent to data entry in batches logged out by date and ID number. When returned, they were logged back in.

Once keyed, each batch was machine edited to ensure that each response was within appropriate ranges and logically consistent with other items on the questionnaire. Errors were printed, and each case with an error was pulled and checked against the file. Once errors were resolved, updates were made to the file, and the edit was rerun to verify accurate correction.

The SEA and SAA files were determined clean for preliminary tabulations in late May 1989, the facilities file in late June 1989. Data from the site visits were declared clean on a file-by-file basis from early to mid-July. Base weights and adjusted weights were calculated and applied to the clean files.

Variance Computations

Background

Variance is a measure of how unreliable a statistic is because of random events that could not be controlled by the data collector. Because different researchers have different conceptions of which events are fixed and which are random, the term variance can mean several different things. In this report, variance is defined in terms of randomness that arises because a sample was interviewed rather than the whole population. This is known more technically as the design variance. If the whole population was selected, this variance would be zero.

Another variance may be thought of in terms of the basic unpredictability of human behavior. Models can be developed to predict the frequency with which a student with certain characteristics will miss classes, but it is impossible to develop a model that predicts such behavior infallibly. Even if the whole population was interviewed, this variance would remain. This variance is known as model variance.

In this report, the only concern is the estimation of design variance. It is important to note that the use of weights increases the variance of estimates. When the weights have been used, it is thus particularly dangerous to rely on variances provided by standard statistical computer software packages or variances calculated with formulas from elementary textbooks. Even if the weight had not been used, the clustering of the sample induces dependencies between the observations that will render simplistic variance estimates too small. Special procedures were thus required to estimate variances.

Summary

Extra weights were calculated that render rather easy the normally complex tasks of estimating design variances. These weights are known as replicated weights. Once these replicated weights had been calculated, the following steps were carried out to estimate the variance on, for example, the number of Chapter 1 participants as reported by facilities. First, an estimate was created using the regular final weight for principals. Then 20 additional estimates were created using each of the replicated weights. The estimated number of participants varied from replicate to replicate. Each replicated estimate was subtracted from the full-sample estimate. Each difference was squared. The squared differences were added together. Finally, the sum of squared differences was divided by 20. This average squared difference is the estimate of the variance.

Formulaically, the variance estimator is

$$\delta (X_t - X)^2 / 20,$$

where X is the regular estimate and X_t is the tth replicated estimate.

Technical Details

The task of creating the replicated weights themselves is rather difficult. Some of the details are difficult to explain. This section is thus provided principally for documentary reasons.

Readers who are interested in the topic are urged to first get a general background in the subject by reading Wolter (1985). Most readers can safely skip this section.

There are many competing schemes for assigning replicated weights. The scheme chosen for this project has met with considerable success. It is called balanced half-samples or balanced repeated replication (BRR). The sample is divided into clusters known as variance clusters. These clusters are arranged into pairs known as variance strata. One variance cluster from each variance stratum receives a double weight. This new set of weights is called replicate weight #1. (Note that just half the sample receives a non-zero weight -- hence the name.) The process is repeated with a different half-sample resulting in replicate weight #2. With 28 pairs, there are more than 200 million possible half-samples. Mathematical theory shows, however, that it is only necessary to repeat the process for a special set of all half-samples. Such a set is known as a balanced set. The number of replicates in a balanced set is either equal to the number of variance strata or a little higher, but not more than 3 higher. Balanced half-samples were used to estimate variances. The number of variance clusters and strata formed and the exact methodology varied from file to file.

Replicated weights for the sample of 120 institutions. The 113 sampled units not selected with certainty were restored to the order in which they had been selected. Variance strata were then assigned in the pattern 1, 1, 1, 1, 2, 2, 2, 2, 3, 3, 3, 3,..., 27, 27, 27, 27, 28, 28, 28, 28, 28. Within that same sort, variance clusters were assigned in the pattern A, B, A, B, A,...., A, B, A. An orthogonal matrix of positive and negative ones was obtained with dimension 28-by-28. Each row of the matrix was merged onto all cases with the corresponding variance stratum (e.g., 12th row onto each of the four cases in variance stratum 12). The 28 replicated base weights were then created for each case by multiplying $BW_{120,i}$ by $(1+d_{ij})$ if the case was an A variance cluster and by $(1-d_{ij})$ if the case was in a B variance cluster, where d_{ij} is the jth column of the ith row. The replicated base weights for the 7 certainty institutions were just set equal to the number 1 because they represent only themselves. After creating the replicated base weights, the nonresponse adjustment was repeated 28 times using tallies formed with the replicated base weights. This procedure led to 28 replicated final weights.

Replicated weights for the EPA file. The 36 eligible noncertainty facilities were restored to the order of selection. Variance strata were assigned in the pattern 1, 1, 2, 2, 3, 3,...,18, 18. Within that same sort, variance cluster codes were assigned in the pattern A, B, A, B, A,...,A,

B, A. An orthogonal matrix of positive and negative ones was obtained with dimension 20-by-20. Each of the first 18 rows of the matrix was merged onto all cases with the corresponding variance stratum. Twenty replicated weights were then created for each case by multiplying $BW_{EPA,i}$ by $(1+d_{ij})$ if the case was in an *A* variance cluster and by $(1-d_{ij})$ if the Case was in a *B* variance cluster, where d_{ij} is the *j*th column of the *i*th row. The replicated weights for the 2 certainty institutions were just set equal to the number 1. This led to 20 replicated final weights.

Replicated weights for the Chapter 1 Coordinator file. Responding facilities #224, #225, and #227 were assigned to variance stratum 1, #224 to half-sample A and #225 and #227 to half-sample B (#226 was a nonrespondent). The remaining 32 responding noncertainty facilities were sorted by the order of selection. Additional variance strata were assigned in the pattern 2, 2, 3, 3,...,17, 17. Within that same sort, half-sample codes were assigned in the pattern A, B, A, B, A,...A, B, A. The same orthogonal matrix was used as had been used for principals. Each of the first 17 rows of the matrix was merged onto all cases with the corresponding variance stratum. Twenty replicated weights were then created for each case by multiplying $BW_{EPA,i}$ by $(1+d_{ij})$ for half-sample A and $(1-d_{ij})$ for half-sample B, for variance strata 2 through 17. For variance stratum 1, a factor of $2.67(1+d_{ij})/2$ was applied to half-sample A and a factor of $1.6(1-d_{ij})/2$ to half-sample B. The replicated weights for the two certainty institutions were just set equal to the number 1.

Replicated weights for the student questionnaire file. Responding facilities #220, #223, and #224 were assigned to variance stratum 1, #223 to half-sample A, and #220 and #224 to half-sample B (#222 contained no completes). The remaining responding 32 noncertainty facilities were sorted by the order of selection. Additional variance strata were assigned in the pattern 2, 2, 3, 3, 4, 4,...,17, 17. Within that same sort, half-sample codes were assigned in the pattern A, B, A, B, A,...A, B, A. These variance strata and half-sample assignments for the institution were then merged onto each of the individual student records within the facility. As a result, everyone from the same facility has the same variance stratum and cluster. The certainty facilities, #239 and #240, were assigned variance strata 18 and 19, respectively. The records for completed student questionnaires within these two certainty facilities were sorted by whatever serial number was available. Within that sort, the students were alternately assigned to half-sample A and half-sample B.

Using the same 20-by-20 orthogonal matrix, each of the first 19 rows of the matrix was merged onto all cases with the corresponding variance stratum. Twenty replicated weights for each case by perturbing $FW_{S,ij}$. For variance stratum 1, a factor of $1.67(1+d_{ij})/2$ was applied to half-sample A and a factor of $2.50(1-d_{ij})/2$ to half-sample B. For variance strata 2 through 17, factors of $(MOS_i/MOS_{iA})(1+d_{ij})/2$ for half-sample A and $(MOS_i/MOS_{iB})(1+d_{ij})/2$ for half-sample B were applied, where MOS stands for measure of size (square root of originally projected Chapter 1 participation). For variance strata 18 and 19, $FW_{S,ij}$ was multiplied by $(1+d_{ij})$ for half-sample A and $(1-d_{ij})$ for half-sample B.

Replicated weights for the student abstract file. The 18 variance strata and 36 half-samples from the EPA file were merged onto the file. This put legitimate values on all records except students within the two certainty facilities. Within the two certainty facilities (#239 and #240), variance strata and clusters were assigned by the same scheme as for the student questionnaires. (The same scheme was used, but the results were different because the pattern of nonresponse varied.)

Using the same 20-by-20 orthogonal matrix, each of the rows of the matrix was merged onto all cases with the corresponding variance stratum. Twenty replicated weights were then created for each case by perturbing $FW_{A,i}$. For variance strata 1 through 18, factors of $(MOS_i/MOS_{iA})(1+d_{ij})/2$ for half-sample A and $(MOS_i/MOS_{iB})(1+d_{ij})/2$ for half-sample B were applied. For variance strata 19 and 20, factors of $(1+d_{ij})$ for half-sample A and $(1-d_{ij})$ for half-sample B were applied.

Replicated weights for the Chapter 1 teachers. These were created by simply repeating the transformation of the EPA weights into Chapter 1 teacher weights on each of the replicated EPA weights.

Replicated weights for the regular teachers. Responding facilities #212, #213, and #214 were assigned to variance stratum 1, #212 and #213 to half-sample A, and #214 to half-sample B (#215 contained no completes). The remaining 32 noncertainty facilities were sorted by the order of selection. Additional variance strata were assigned in the patter 2, 2, 3, 3, 4, 4,...,17, 17. Within that same sort, half-sample codes were assigned in the pattern A, B, A, B, A,...A, B, A. The variance strata and half-sample for the institution were merged onto the individual regular teacher records within the facility. Certainty facilities #239 and #240 were assigned to variance

strata 18 and 19, respectively. The records for completed regular teachers within these two certainty facilities were sorted by whatever serial number was available. Within that sort, the records were assigned alternately to half-sample A and half-sample B.

Using the same 20-by-20 orthogonal matrix, each of the first 19 rows of the matrix was merged onto all cases with the corresponding variance stratum. Twenty replicated weights were then created for each case by perturbing $FW_{RT,i}$. The factors of $(1+d_{ij})$ for half-sample A and $(1-d_{ij})$ for half-sample B.

Table of Coefficient of Variation

Coefficient of variation (C.V.) for selected statistics for each weighted data file are provided in Table A-3. For each statistic in the table you may have 95 percent confidence that the statistic lies within the interval described by the estimate plus or minus the standard error times 1.95. Standard error = the C.V. x estimate. For example, you may have 95 percent confidence that the Total Number of Chapter 1 N or D students on October 15, 1988, was between 16,631 and 20,544 [i.e., 18,588 + (18,588 x .053694) or 18,588 - (18,588 x .053694)]. Note, the confidence intervals can be seriously affected by respondent errors. This is particularly evident when comparing the number of Chapter 1 N or D students reported by principals with the weighted number resulting from the site visits.

Table A-3. Table of Coefficient of Variation

Statistic		Estimate	Coefficient of Variation (C.V.%)
Statistics from Survey of Facilities			
1.	Total number of Chapter 1 N or D students on October 15, 1988	18,588	5.3694
2.	Total number of Chapter 1 N or D students in youth facilities	13,514	6.7069
3.	Total number of Chapter 1 N or D students in adult facilities	5,074	8.0246
4.	Average number of inmates in youth facilities	140	8.5086
5.	Average number of inmates in adult facilities	1,207	7.5335
6.	Percent of youth facility budget allocated to education	15.0%	11.8040
7.	Percent of adult facility budget allocated to education	5.0%	5.1246
8.	Total education expenditures in youth facilities	$154,246,282	11.4658
9.	Total education expenditures in adult facilities	$111,487,406	11.1540
10.	Chapter 1 as percent of total education expenditure	10.0%	8.0948
11.	Percent of students receiving Chapter 1	25.0%	9.2505
12.	Percent of student in youth facilities receiving Chapter 1	53.0%	6.6009

Table A-3. Table of Coefficient of Variation (continued)

Statistic		Estimate	Coefficient of Variation (C.V.%)
13.	Percent of students in adult facilities receiving Chapter 1	10.0%	13.6321
14.	Total Chapter 1 expenditures per facility	$72,959	7.8419
15.	Total Chapter 1 expenditures per youth facility	$87,442	9.9611
16.	Total Chapter 1 expenditures per adult facility	$50,548	10.3164
17.	Total Chapter 1 expenditures	$25,312,300	6.9927
18.	Total Chapter 1 expenditures in youth facilities	$18,427,705	8.8886
19.	Total Chapter 1 expenditures in adult facilities	$6,884,595	9.6773
Statistics from EPA Interviews			
1.	Percent recommending increase funding	27.0%	32.1521
2.	Percent recommending improved teacher/administrator commitment	17.0%	37.9842
3.	Percent of youth facility EPAs recommending variety of vocational classes	21.0%	55.8833
4.	Percent of adult facility EPAs recommending increase classroom space	38.0%	45.8145

Table A-3. Table of Coefficient of Variation (continued)

Statistic	Estimate	Coefficient of Variation (C.V.%)
Statistics from Chapter 1 Coordinator Interviews		
1. Percent reporting eligible students not served because of refusal of service	40.0%	32.2057
2. Percent in youth facilities reporting eligible students not served because of refusal of service	26.0%	75.3480
3. Percent of adult facilities reporting eligible students not served because of refusal of service	68.0%	34.9651
4. Percent reporting eligible students not served because of conflict with work schedule	31.0%	36.4723
5. Percent in youth facilities reporting eligible students not served because of conflict with work schedule	13.0%	55.3891
6. Percent in adult facilities reporting eligible students not served because of conflict with work schedule	58.0%	44.8583
7. Percent reporting eligible students not served because of lack of room to serve all eligible	43.0%	29.5032
8. Percent in youth facilities reporting eligible students not served because of lack of room to serve all eligible	62.0%	32.6118
9. Percent in adult facilities reporting eligible students not served because of lack of room to serve all eligible	13.0%	91.3732

Table A-3. Table of Coefficient of Variation (continued)

Statistic		Estimate	Coefficient of Variation (C.V.%)
Statistics from Chapter 1 Teacher Questionnaires			
1.	Average number of years teaching in current facility	6.5	10.5470
2.	Percent reporting that security measures create no problems	51.0%	15.3970
3.	Percent in youth facilities reporting that security measures create no problems	46.0%	21.0347
4.	Percent in adult facilities reporting that security measures create no problems	63.0%	24.5317
5.	Average hours per week spent on instruction inside the classroom	25.9	3.9106
6.	Percent in youth facilities reporting frequent/very frequent use of textbooks	54.0%	15.6658
7.	Percent in adult facilities reporting frequent/very frequent use of textbooks	71.0%	21.2946
8.	Percent in youth facilities reporting frequent/very frequent use of workbooks/ practice sheets	75.0%	5.7329
9.	Percent in adult facilities reporting frequent/very frequent use of workbooks/ practice sheets	62.0%	19.4149
10.	Percent in youth facilities reporting frequent/very frequent use of computers	56.0%	22.7055
11.	Percent in adult facilities reporting frequent/very frequent use of computers	67.0%	34.2880

Table A-3. Table of Coefficient of Variation (continued)

Statistic		Estimate	Coefficient of Variation (C.V.%)
Statistics from Regular Education Program Teacher Questionnaires			
1.	Average number of years in current facility	7.2	11.6380
2.	Percent reporting that security measures create no problem	52.0%	11.3037
3.	Percent in youth facilities reporting that security measures create no problems	56.0%	15.0010
4.	Percent in adult facilities reporting that security measures create no problems	46.0%	15.3218
5.	Average hours per week spent on instruction inside the classroom	25.6	4.1632
6.	Percent in youth facilities reporting frequent/very frequent use of textbooks	73.0%	12.6643
7.	Percent in adult facilities reporting frequent/very frequent use of textbooks	50.0%	26.9482
8.	Percent in youth facilities reporting frequent/very frequent use of workbooks/ practice sheets	69.0%	15.0838
9.	Percent in adult facilities reporting frequent/very frequent use of workbooks/ practice sheets	76.0%	16.1743
10.	Percent in youth facilities reporting frequent/very frequent use of computers	8.0%	44.6094
11.	Percent in adult facilities reporting frequent/very frequent use of computers	30.0%	33.2402

Table A-3. Table of Coefficient of Variation (continued)

Statistic		Estimate	Coefficient of Variation (C.V.%)
Statistics from Student Record Abstract			
1.	Percent of Chapter 1 participants not in school at time of commitment	37.0%	14.7009
2.	Percent of Chapter 1 participants in youth facilities not in school at time of commitment	30.0%	18.4548
3.	Percent of Chapter 1 participants in adult facilities not in school at time of commitment	57.0%	22.8987
4.	Mean number of hours Chapter 1 participants spend in academic classes per week	11.1	10.6535
5.	Mean number of hours Chapter 1 participants in youth facilities spend in academic classes per week	13.8	9.9039
6.	Mean number of hours Chapter 1 participants spend in GED prep classes per week	0.6	36.9916
7.	Mean number of hours Chapter 1 participants spend in Chapter 1 reading classes per week	2.8	23.2973
8.	Mean number of hours Chapter 1 participants spend in Chapter 1 mathematics classes per week	2.5	17.5631

Table A-3. Table of Coefficient of Variation (continued)

Statistic		Estimate	Coefficient of Variation (C.V.%)
Statistics from Student Questionnaire			
1.	Number of Chapter 1 participants	14,348	11.1524
2.	Number of Chapter 1 participants in youth facilities	10,940	10.9935
3.	Number of Chapter 1 participants in adult facilities	3,408	23.9311
4.	Number of nonparticipants	9,528	20.6786
5.	Percent of Chapter 1 participants planning to return to school after leaving facility	79.0%	3.3588
6.	Percent of Chapter 1 participants in youth facilities planning to return to school after leaving facility	83.0%	4.0365
7.	Percent of Chapter 1 participants in adult facilities planning to return to school after leaving facility	66.0%	4.8296
8.	Percent of Chapter 1 students 15 years old	11.0%	22.6833
9.	Percent of Chapter 1 students 16 years old	19.0%	15.7081
10.	Percent of Chapter 1 students 17 years old	28.0%	16.5816

APPENDIX B

Results of the Factor Analysis of Student Attitude Scales

APPENDIX B

Results of the Factor Analysis of Student Attitude Scales

All items measuring attitudes toward self and toward school and learning were subjected to a factor analysis to investigate the dimensionality and factorial structure presumed to be measured by conceptual areas. Weighted response data from representative samples of Chapter 1 and regular education programs in adult and youth facilities were include in this analysis.

Factors were extracted with a principal factors solution. Item communalities were initially estimated by the multiple R^2 and then iterated to a five-factor solution. Although the initial orthogonal rotation yielded reasonable clear factor structures, clearer and more reliable independent factor scales were obtained by eliminating items with low communalities, low factor loadings, or significant loadings on more than one factor. The final factor analysis was iterated to a three-factor solution that is contained in Table B-1.

Attitudinal scales obtained were self-esteem, locus of control, and attitudes toward learning and toward teachers. The reasonableness of the factor analytic solutions was checked by obtaining scores for each of the independent scales and intercorrelating the scales. Scale intercorrelations should be sufficiently small to justify the conclusion that the scales actually provide measures of different student attitudes. No correlation exists between the locus-of-control scale and attitudes toward learning, and a very low .20 correlation exists between self-esteem and attitudes toward learning. A low .32 correlation between locus-of-control and self-esteem exists, somewhat lower than the .40 correlation found in the previous evaluation of Chapter 1 N or D programs (see Keesling et al., 1979). Cronbach's alpha reliability estimates for locus of control and self-esteem scales ranged from an acceptable .70 to .75.

Table B-1. Factor Scale and Loadings

Factor Loadings	
Locus of Control	
.63	All in all, I pretty much feel that I am a failure.
.62	In my life, good luck is more important than hard work for success.
.61	My plans hardly ever work out, so planning only makes me unhappy.
.59	Chance and luck are very important for what happens in my life.
.54	I feel I do not have much to be proud of.
.53	I don't have enough control over the direction my life is taking.
.53	It will be hard for me to stay out of trouble with the law now that I have been in a place like this.
.49	Every time I try to get ahead, something or somebody stops me.
.48	I try to accept my condition in life, rather than try to change things.
.44	I certainly feel useless at times.
.43	I think that having been here will hurt my chances of getting a good job after I get out.
.38	I wish I could have more respect for myself.
Attitude Toward Learning	
.79	I am learning a lot in my classes here.
.72	I am learning things that I will need to know when I leave here.
.71	Teachers here care what happens to me after I leave.
.65	Compared to the last school I attended, I'm learning a lot more here.
.64	My teachers tell me when I am doing well.
Self-Esteem	
.63	On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.
.60	I feel good about myself.
.54	At times I think I am no good at all.
.51	I feel like I have a number of good qualities.
.49	I am able to do things as well as most other people.
.45	I feel I am a person of worth, the equal of other people.

APPENDIX C

Survey Questionnaires

Student ID:

OMB No.: 1885-0512
Expiration date: 9/90

STUDY OF THE ECIA CHAPTER 1 NEGLECTED OR DELINQUENT PROGRAM

Survey of Students in State-Operated Facilities with Chapter 1 N or D Programs

PEEL HERE

This survey is being conducted by the U.S. Department of Education. The survey is about young people committed to facilities for delinquent youth and adult correctional facilities. It asks about your education and other learning experiences.

Your careful and thoughtful answers to the survey questions will help those who plan education programs like the one you are in.

This is a voluntary survey and you do not have to answer the questions in this questionnaire. However, this is an important study, and your help will be appreciated. Your answers will be kept confidential and will not be reported in anyway that can be identified with you.

First, we would like to have some information about you

1. Circle the number that shows how old you are.

13 or younger	1
14	2
15	3
16	4
17	5
18	6
19	7
20	8
21 or older	9

2. Circle the number that describes your race/ethnicity.

White, not Hispanic	1
Black, not Hispanic	2
Hispanic	3
American Indian or Alaskan Native	4
Asian or Pacific Islander	5
Other (SPECIFY)_____	
_____	6

3. What is the last grade that you completed in school before you came here?

_____
GRADE

We would like to know what classes you are presently taking. The questionnaire administrator will explain which classes each question refers to.

4. Are you taking ACADEMIC classes?

Yes	1
No	2

5. Are you taking GED PREPARATION classes?

Yes	1
No	2

6. Are you taking ADULT BASIC EDUCATION classes?

Yes	1
No	2

7. Are you taking VOCATIONAL classes?

Yes	1
No	2

8. Are you taking CHAPTER 1 READING classes?

Yes 1
No 2

9. Are you taking CHAPTER 1 MATHEMATICS classes?

Yes 1
No 2

10. Are you taking CHAPTER 1 LANGUAGE ARTS classes?

Yes 1
No 2

11. What other Chapter 1 classes do you take? List them below.

_____

_____

_____

_____

12a. About how many times in the past week and month have you missed class?

_____
TIMES LAST WEEK

_____
TIMES LAST MONTH

12b. Circle the reasons that generally cause you to miss going to class and then circle the one most frequent reason.

		CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY	CIRCLE THE MOST FREQUENT REASON
a.	I never missed class	1	NA
b.	Sick	2	2
c.	Court appearance	3	3
d.	Lock-up	4	4
e.	Counseling	5	5
f.	Work program	6	6
g.	Other (SPECIFY) _____		
	_____	7	7

We would like some information about your life before you came here

13. Which of the following best describes the place where you lived before you came here?

A city/urban area	1
A suburban community	2
A rural or farming community	3

14. Which of the following people lived in the same household with you? (CIRCLE THE NUMBER FOR ALL THAT APPLY.)

I lived alone	1
Father	2
Other male guardian (stepfather/foster father)	3
Mother	4
Other female guardian (stepmother/foster mother)	5
Brother(s) and/or sister(s) (including half-or step-)	6
Grandparent(s)	7
My husband/wife	8
My child/children	9
Other relatives (children or adults)	10
Non-relatives (children or adults)	11

15. Which of the following were in your home? (CIRCLE ONE ON EACH LINE.)

		Had	Did not have
a.	A specific place for study?	1	2
b.	A daily newspaper?	1	2
c.	An encyclopedia?	1	2
d.	An atlas?	1	2
e.	A dictionary?	1	2
f.	A typewriter?	1	2
g.	A computer?	1	2
h.	More than 50 books?	1	2

16. Think about the last school you attended before coming here. Circle the number for the statement that best describes how you were doing schoolwork. (CIRCLE ONLY ONE.)

I was doing very well	1
I was doing pretty well	2
I was doing poorly	3
I was doing very poorly	4

17. How often have you changed schools since the first grade? (CIRCLE ONLY ONE.)

Less than three times	1
Three or four times	2
Five or six times	3
Seven or more times	4

18. How sure are you that you will graduate from high school? (CIRCLE ONLY ONE.)

Very sure I'll graduate	1
I'll probably graduate	2
I probably won't graduate	3
Very sure I won't graduate	4

19. What is the reason that you were sent here? (CIRCLE ONLY ONE.)

A crime against property	1
A crime against a person	2
A drug offense	3
Other (PLEASE SPECIFY)_____	
_____	4

20. How much longer do you think you will be here? (CIRCLE ONLY ONE.)

3 months or less	1
4 - 6 months	2
7 - 9 months	3
10 - 12 months	4
more than 12 months	5
I don't know	6

<u>Now, we'd like to know what you plan to do after you leave here</u>

21. Do you plan to go back to school after you leave here?

Yes	1	
No	2	(SKIP TO QUESTION 23)

22. What type of school do you plan to attend? (CIRCLE ONLY ONE THEN GO TO QUESTION 25.)

Grade School	1
Middle or Junior High School	2
High School	3
Alternative school	4
Vocational Technical or Business school	5
Junior or Community College	6
College or University	7

23. Why don't you think you'll go back to school?

		CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY	CIRCLE ONE MAIN REASON
a.	Have to work	1	1
b.	Can't get into school	2	2
c.	Can't do the school work	3	3
d.	Not interested in school	4	4
e.	Finished school	5	5
f.	Don't know/no reason	6	6
g.	Other (SPECIFY)_____		
	_____		
	_____	7	7

24. If you went back to school, would your parents or some other relative be able to support you financially?

Yes	1
No	2

25. As things stand now, how far in school do you think you will get? (CIRCLE THE ONE BEST ANSWER.)

Won't finish school	1
Will graduate from high school, but not go any farther	2
Will go to vocational, trade, or business school after high school	3
Will attend college	4
Will graduate from college	5
Will attend a higher level of school after graduating from college	6

26. Do you plan to get a job right after you leave here?

Yes	1	
No	2	(SKIP TO QUESTION 29)

27. Would you like a full-time or part-time job? (CIRCLE ONLY ONE.)

Full-time	1
Part-time	2
I don't know	3

28. About how much money an hour do you think you might be able to earn at that job? (CIRCLE ONLY ONE.)

About $3.00 an hour	1
About $4.00 an hour	2
About $5.00 an hour	3
About $6.00 an hour	4
More than $6.00 an hour	5

29. What kind of work would you like to be doing when you are 30 years old? (CIRCLE THE ONE ANSWER THAT COMES CLOSEST TO WHAT YOU EXPECT TO BE DOING.)

Craftsperson or Operator	01
Farmer or Farm Manager	02
Housewife/Homemaker	03
Laborer or Farm Worker	04
Military, Police, or Security Officer	05
Professional, Business, or Managerial	06
Owner	07
Technical	08
Salesperson, Clerical, or Office Worker	09
Science or Engineering Professional	10
Service Worker	11
Other (please describe)_____	
_____	12
Not working	13
I don't know	14

30. How do you feel about each of the following statements? (CIRCLE ONE RESPONSE FOR EACH STATEMENT.)

		Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
a.	I feel good about myself	1	2	3	4
b.	I don't have enough control over the direction my life is taking	1	2	3	4
c.	In my life, good luck is more important than hard work for success	1	2	3	4

		Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
d.	I feel I am a person of worth; the equal of other people	1	2	3	4
e.	I am able to do things as well as most other people	1	2	3	4
f.	Every time I try to get ahead, something or somebody stops me	1	2	3	4
g.	My plans hardly ever work out, so planning only makes me unhappy	1	2	3	4
h.	I try to accept my condition in life, rather than try to change things	1	2	3	4
i.	On the whole, I am satisfied with myself	1	2	3	4
j.	I certainly feel useless at times	1	2	3	4
k.	I have a big influence over the things that happen to me	1	2	3	4
l.	At times I think I am no good at all	1	2	3	4
m.	When I make plans, I am almost certain I can make them work	1	2	3	4
n.	I feel I do not have much to be proud of	1	2	3	4
o.	What happens to me is my own doing	1	2	3	4
p.	I feel that I have a number of good qualities	1	2	3	4
q.	Chance and luck are very important for what happens in my life	1	2	3	4
r.	I wish I could have more respect for myself	1	2	3	4
s.	All in all, I pretty much feel that I am a failure	1	2	3	4
t.	I am learning a lot in my classes here	1	2	3	4

		Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
u.	I am learning things that I will need to know when I leave here.....	1	2	3	4
v.	It will be hard for me to stay out of trouble with the law now that I have been in a place like this.....	1	2	3	4
w.	Teachers here care what happens to me after I leave.....	1	2	3	4
x.	I think that having been here will hurt my changes of getting a good job after I get out.....	1	2	3	4
y.	My teachers tell me when I am doing well	1	2	3	3
z.	Compared to the last school I attended, I'm learning a lot more here.....	1	2	3	4

Please enter the names of two persons to contact with addresses and telephone numbers where we might reach you in six months or after you leave the institution.

1. NAME: _____

RELATIONSHIP: _____

STREET: _____

CITY, STATE, ZIP: _____

TELEPHONE: ( ) _____

2. NAME: _____

RELATIONSHIP: _____

STREET: _____

CITY, STATE, ZIP: _____

TELEPHONE: ( ) _____

THANK YOU

Study conducted by:

Westat, Inc.
1650 Research Blvd.
Rockville, MD 20850
(800) 937-8281

In affiliation with:

Policy Studies Associates, Inc.
1718 Connecticut Ave., N.W.
Washington, DC 20009
and
Research & Training Associates
75 Corporate Woods
10800 Farley
Overland Park, KS 66210

Respondent ID:

OMB No.: 1885-0512
Expiration date: 9/90

STUDY OF THE ECIA CHAPTER 1 NEGLECTED OR DELINQUENT PROGRAM

Regular Education Program Teacher Questionnaire

Chapter 1 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act (ECIA) authorizes, among other programs, services to meet the special educational needs of neglected or delinquent youth in State-operated facilities.

This survey is part of a major national assessment of the Chapter 1 Neglected or Delinquent (N or D) program sponsored by the U.S. Department of Education.

A comprehensive study of Chapter 1 N or D requires information on the environment in which the program operates as well as the Chapter 1 program itself. To this end, a nationally representative sample of regular education teachers who work in facilities with N or D programs is being asked to complete this questionnaire. Although you are not required to respond, your cooperation is needed to make the results of the survey comprehensive and accurate. The information in this questionnaire will be treated confidentially and will be reported only in the aggregate; therefore, you should not record your name on the questionnaire.

This questionnaire is to be completed only by teachers who have no Chapter 1 classes.

Study conducted by:

Westat, Inc.
1650 Research Blvd.
Rockville, MD 20850
(800) 937-8281

In affiliation with:

Policy Studies Associates, Inc.
1718 Connecticut Ave., N.W.
Washington, DC 20009
and
Research & Training Associates
75 Corporate Woods
10800 Farley
Overland Park, KS 66210

Please return questionnaire to Chapter 1 study team leader in the envelope provided.

PART A: BACKGROUND

A-1. At the end of this school year, how many total years will you have been teaching at this facility? ... _____

A-2. Please indicate whether you teach full-time or part-time at this facility by circling the appropriate number.

Full-time	1
Part-time	2

A-3. Please enter the number of years of experience you have had in each of the settings below. Enter zero "0" wherever appropriate.

a. Teaching other than Chapter 1 in correctional institutions..... _____

b. Teaching Chapter 1 in correctional institutions..... _____

c. Teaching other than Chapter 1 in public or private school settings..... _____

d. Teaching Chapter 1 in public or private school settings..... _____

e. Non-teaching position in correctional setting..... _____

A-4. What is the highest level of schooling or degree that you have completed?

No college degree or certificate	1
Certificate or degree based on less than four years of college	2
Bachelor's degree	3
Beyond Bachelor's degree but not a Master's or Doctorate	4
Master's degree	5
Beyond Master's degree but not a Doctorate	6
Doctoral degree	7
Other (specify)_____ _____	8

A-5. Do you have a valid State teaching certificate?

Yes	1	
No	2	(SKIP TO QUESTION A-7)

A-6a. Do you hold a State teaching certificate or credentials in the area(s) in which you are currently teaching?

Yes	1
No	2

A-6b. Please indicate the level (e.g., elementary, secondary, adult) and area (e.g., English, remedial instruction, cosmetology) of your teaching certificate.

1. Level: _____

2. Area: _____

A-7. If you could choose, where would you like to work? (CIRCLE ONLY ONE.)

I would work in this facility	1
I would work in another correctional facility	2
I would work in a regular public school	3
I would work in a regular private school	4
Other (specify) _____	5

A-8. In which of the following areas do you have formal coursework (i.e., college/graduate credit course), in-service (staff development) training, or prior work experience? (CIRCLE THE NUMBER FOR ALL THAT APPLY.)

		(1) Formal coursework	(2) In-service training	(3) Prior work experience
a.	Remedial instruction in mathematics	1	1	1
b.	Remedial instruction in reading	1	1	1
c.	Diagnosis of special learning problems	1	1	1
d.	Counseling or social work	1	1	1
e.	Education in a correctional setting	1	1	1

A-9. During the last three years, how many hours of staff development/in-service training have you had in areas related to instructional planning or presentation? _____

A-10. During the last three years, how many college-level or graduate-level courses have you had in areas related to instructional planning or presentation? ..... _____

PART B: TEACHING RESPONSIBILITIES

B-1. Please indicate how many months you taught in this facility during 1988. ..... _____

B-2. What subjects are you currently teaching? (CIRCLE THE ONE (1) FOR ALL THAT APPLY.)

a.	Reading	1
b.	Language arts	1
c.	Mathematics	1
d.	Social studies	1
e.	Science	1
f.	Social skills/life skills	1
g.	Adult basic education	1
h.	English as a second language/bilingual education	1
i.	Other remedial instruction	1
j.	GED preparation	1
k.	Vocational education	1
l.	Post-secondary classes	1
m.	Other (specify) _____	1

B-3. On a typical day, how many classes do you teach? ..... _____

B-4. Please estimate the number of hours you spend each week performing the following.

		Hours per Week
a.	Instruction inside the classroom	_____
b.	Classroom preparation	_____
c.	Conversation with students, outside the classroom	_____
d.	Staff meetings or in-service training	_____
e.	Other responsibilities (specify)	
	_____	_____
	_____	_____

B-5. Approximately what percent of your time in the classroom (Question B-4a) is spent in the following activities?

a.	Academic interaction	_____%
b.	Personal/social development of students	_____%
c.	Noninstructional tasks (e.g., attendance)	_____%
d.	Other classroom activities	_____%
	TOTAL CLASSROOM TIME	100%

B-6. Of the time you spend in academic interaction (Question B-5a), approximately what percentage is spent in the following activities?

a.	Presenting and/or explaining information	_____%
b.	Monitoring students' academic performance	_____%
c.	Providing feedback to students on their academic performance	_____%
d.	Other academic interaction activities	_____%
	TOTAL ACADEMIC INTERACTION	100%

B-7. Of the time spent on noninstructional activities (Question B-5c), approximately what percentage is spent in the following activities?

a.	Behavior management	_____%
b.	Management tasks (e.g., distributing materials, giving directions, reporting attendance)	_____%
c.	Other noninstructional activities	_____%
	TOTAL NONINSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES	100%

B-8. For a typical class, please estimate the percentage of class time that students are actively engaged in academic activities. ..... _____%

B-9. Please indicate how often students are absent from your classes for the following reasons. (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER ON EACH LINE.)

		Almost never	Sometimes	Frequently
a.	Work detail	1	2	3
b.	Counseling	1	2	3
c.	Security or disciplinary reasons.....	1	2	3
d.	Other institutional activities.....	1	2	3

B-10. Are any problems created for you as a teacher by the security measures at this facility? Please read each option and circle the one (1) beside all that apply.

a. Security measures create no problems for me..... 1

b. Classes are often shut down for security reasons 1

c. There is a lack of free movement between classrooms 1

d. There is a lack of adequate security..... 1

e. Classroom doors have to be locked..... 1

f. Equipment has to be locked up and is hard to get at 1

g. Classroom materials are subject to censorship..... 1

h. Groups of students are restricted from coming to class 1

i. Certain groups of students are not allowed in the same classroom together 1

j. Custody personnel interfere with the educational program..... 1

k. Other (specify)_____ 1

PART C: RESOURCES

C-1. Please indicate the frequency with which you use each of the instructional materials listed below. (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER ON EACH LINE.)

Materials	Frequency of Use: Never used	Seldom used	Occasional use	Frequent use	Very frequent use
a. Textbooks	1	2	3	4	5
b. Teacher-developed materials	1	2	3	4	5
c. Programmed materials	1	2	3	4	5
d. Workbooks and practice sheets	1	2	3	4	5
e. Manipulative materials (e.g., games, puzzles)	1	2	3	4	5
f. Life skills materials (e.g., newspapers, forms, applications)	1	2	3	4	5
g. Audiovisual equipment and materials (e.g., tapes, tape recorders, films)	1	2	3	4	5
h. Computers	1	2	3	4	5
i. Computer software	1	2	3	4	5
j. Vocational education equipment and material	1	2	3	4	5

C-2. Which, if any, of the materials listed above are not available in sufficient quantity to meet your instructional needs?

_____

_____

_____

C-3. Are the materials you use for teaching primarily at the students' (CIRCLE ONE.):

Grade level,	1
Achievement level, or	2
English language proficiency level?	3
None of the above is primary	4

C-4. Do you think the materials you use match the students':

	Yes	No
a. Ability levels?	1	2
b. Age levels?	1	2
c. English language proficiency levels?	1	2

PART D: TEACHING METHODS

D-1. Do you plan course content based on:

	Yes	No
a. Standardized achievement test scores?	1	2
b. Standardized diagnostic test scores? (Diagnostic tests identify specific weaknesses)	1	2
c. Criterion or objective referenced test scores?	1	2

D-2. Which of the following are contained in individual plans for students?

	Yes	No
a. Individual student performance objectives	1	2
b. Planned sequence of courses	1	2
c. Timeframe for achievement of objectives	1	2
d. Supplementary services required	1	2
e. We have no individual plans for students	1	2

D-3. How often are individual student performance objectives updated? (CIRCLE ONE.)

We have no individual student performance objectives	1
We have individual student performance objectives, but they are not updated after they are established	2
Daily	3
Weekly	4
Monthly	5
Less than monthly	6

D-4. Which one of the following statements best describes the educational approach you most frequently use in your classes?

Totally individualized learning	1
Small-group learning	2
Whole-class learning	3

D-5. Besides your own judgement, do you use any of the following to tell you how well a student is progressing in the subjects you teach?

	Yes	No	D-5x. IF YES: Do you use it only at entry or other times? Entry	Other
a. Standardized achievement test scores	1	2	1	2
b. Standardized diagnostic test scores	1	2	1	2
c. English language proficiency test scores	1	2	1	2
d. Criterion or objective referenced test scores	1	2	1	2
e. Individualized skills inventory	1	2	1	2
f. Other teachers' judgements	1	2	1	2

D-6. In evaluating your students' academic progress, do you consult with or use information from other teachers or aides?

Yes 1
No ..... 2 (SKIP TO QUESTION D-8)

D-7. Do you use information from any of the following in evaluating student progress?

	Yes	No	NA
a. The student's other regular classroom teachers	1	2	3
b. Aides	1	2	3
c. Chapter 1 teachers	1	2	3
d. Other compensatory education or remedial teachers	1	2	3
e. Any other teachers (specify)_____	1	2	3

D-8. How frequently do you share, either formally or informally, information about the progress of your students with:

	At least weekly	At least monthly	Several times/ year	Never	NA
a. Your students?	1	2	3	4	
b. Your students' other teachers?	1	2	3	4	5
c. Other treatment staff?	1	2	3	4	

D-9. How often do you:

	At least weekly	At least monthly	Several times/ year	Once/ year	Never	NA
a. Meet with educational administrative staff to identify program needs?	1	2	3	4	5	6
b. Participate in meetings on education program plans/procedures?	1	2	3	4	5	6
c. Participate in meetings on Chapter 1 program plans/procedures?	1	2	3	4	5	6

		Yes	No	NA
D-10.	Are you involved in the development of written lesson plans for Chapter 1 students?	1	2	3
D-11.	Do you meet with Chapter 1 teachers to discuss the instructional needs of Chapter 1 students whom you also teach?	1	2	3

PART E: OPINIONS AND PERCEPTIONS

E-1. The following statements describe possible attitudes and behaviors of education administrators regarding the regular education program. Circle one number on each line to indicate your level of agreement with each statement.

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree
a. Education administrators have established goals for the program and clearly articulate them	1	2	3	4	5
b. Education administrators communicate positive attitudes about the program to students, teachers, and other institution staff	1	2	3	4	5
c. Education administrators plan cooperatively with teachers to implement program improvement efforts	1	2	3	4	5
d. Education administrators actively support the Chapter 1 program	1	2	3	4	5
e. Education administrators demonstrate interpersonal and organizational management skills	1	2	3	4	5
f. Education administrators observe classroom instruction and provide helpful feedback to teachers	1	2	3	4	5

E-2. Please indicate how often each of the following occurs in your classroom instruction.

	Almost never	Sometimes	Frequently	Almost always
a. Students seek clarification about directions	1	2	3	4
b. Reteaching is provided	1	2	3	4
c. Students are asked questions to check for understanding	1	2	3	4
d. Students work at academic tasks that provide them with at least 80% rates of success	1	2	3	4
e. Opportunities are provided for skill and knowledge application to real-life situations	1	2	3	4
f. Feedback on student performance is specific and refers to skill competencies	1	2	3	4
g. Feedback on student performance is immediate	1	2	3	4

E-3. Please indicate how often the following descriptions are characteristic of your teaching.

	Almost never	Sometimes	Frequently	Almost always
a. I communicate high achievement expectations to students	1	2	3	4
b. I clearly express the belief that all students can learn	1	2	3	4
c. I communicate respect, interest, and caring to students	1	2	3	4
d. I set challenging yet realistic goals for students	1	2	3	4
e. I incorporate student choice of learning activities into my classroom practices	1	2	3	4

E-4. What do you believe are the three most important factors that promote learning in your classroom(s)? Student characteristics, instructional characteristics, teacher characteristics, and institutional characteristics are examples of the factors that may affect learning.

a. _____

_____

b. _____

_____

c. _____

_____

E-5. What do you believe are the three most important factors that obstruct learning in your classroom?

a. _____

_____

b. _____

_____

c. _____

_____

THANK YOU

OMB No.: 1885-0512
Expiration date: 9/90

STUDY OF THE ECIA CHAPTER 1 NEGLECTED OR DELINQUENT PROGRAM

Survey of State Education Agencies

LABEL

DIRECTIONS

This questionnaire concerns the State Education Agency (SEA) and its role in administering the Chapter 1 Neglected or Delinquent (N or D) program in your State. Independent of this request, the State Applicant Agency (SAA) is being requested to respond to similar questions regarding its role in the N or D program.

This questionnaire seeks information on State application and evaluation requirements; State monitoring, auditing, and technical assistance; finance and staffing. Most questions ask that you circle one or more numbers that best describe Chapter 1 N or D in your State. Some items ask for a brief narrative response. A very limited number of items ask for statistical information. Estimates are important if exact data are not available. Please indicate a figure is an estimate by parentheses. We recognize that in some States all the information requested in this form may not be available to a single person. If this is the case in your State, we encourage you to refer such items to the most knowledgeable person, whether on your staff or in another office within the State education agency.

Although you are not required to respond, your cooperation is needed to make the results of the survey comprehensive and accurate. Please use the enclosed prepaid envelope to return the questionnaire to:

Westat, Inc.
ATTN: Linda LeBlanc
1650 Research Boulevard
Rockville, Maryland 20850

A. CHAPTER 1 NEGLECTED OR DELINQUENT PROGRAM APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS

A-1. In this State, how often does the State Education Agency (SEA) require the State Applicant Agency/agencies (SAA(s)) to apply to the SEA for N or D program funds?

Annual application required	1
Every 3 years with annual updates	2
Other (SPECIFY) _____	
_____	3

A-2. What content is included in the application? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY.)

a.	Description of the project	1
b.	Data demonstrating maintenance of effort	2
c.	Chapter 1 budget	3
d.	Needs assessment data	4
e.	Procedures to identify students to receive services	5
f.	Information on institutions (could include name, location, type, populations, number in Chapter 1, etc.)	6
g.	Evaluation data	7
h.	Description of other educational programs	8
i.	Other (SPECIFY) _____	
	_____	
	_____	
	_____	9

A-3. Are there areas in which the State Applicant Agency issues assurances to the SEA?

Yes	1	
No	2	(SKIP TO QUESTION A-5)

A-4. Circle the number for each area in which the SAA is expected to issue assurances or provide data concerning the Chapter 1 program to the SEA.

		Assurances	Data	Neither
a.	Maintenance of effort	1	2	3
b.	Comparability	1	2	3
c.	Needs assessment	1	2	3
d.	Evaluation	1	2	3
e.	Sustained gains	1	2	3
f.	Other (SPECIFY) _____			
	_____	1	2	3

A-5. Does the SEA have a statewide minimum standard, other than the Federal standard (under 21 without a high school diploma) that is used for funding purposes (e.g., test score, number of years below grade level, etc.), that determines student eligibility to receive Chapter 1 N or D services?

Yes, we have a different standard	1	
No, we use the Federal standard	2	(SKIP TO QUESTION A-7)

A-6. Please describe the SEA's minimum standard used to determine student eligibility for Chapter 1 N or D services.

_____

_____

_____

A-7. Was a minimum standard (other than the Federal standard) used to determine student eligibility for N or D services during the 1981-82 fiscal year (the last operational year of Title I)?

Yes, we use a different standard	1	
No, we use the Federal standard	2	(SKIP TO QUESTION B-1)

A-8. Is this a different standard than the one that is currently used?

Yes	1
No	2

A-9. Please describe the minimum standard that was used in FY 1981-82 to determine student eligibility for N or D services.

_____

_____

_____

A-10. Please describe the reason(s) for the minimum standard change from 1981-82 to 1987-88.

_____

_____

_____

A-11. Is there a statewide curriculum focus for the Chapter 1 N or D program?

Yes	1	
No	2	(SKIP TO QUESTION B-1)

A-12. Please describe the curriculum focus.

_____

_____

_____

B. SEA REQUIREMENTS FOR PROGRAM EVALUATION

B-1. How often must the SAAs submit Chapter1 N or D program evaluations to the SEA?

Once a year	1
Every 2 years	2
Every 3 years	3
Other (SPECIFY) _____ _____	4

B-2. What is required in the Chapter 1 N or D program evaluation which is submitted to the SEA? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY.)

a.	Number of students eligible for Chapter 1 under federal funding guidelines	1
b.	Number eligible to receive Chapter 1 services under State guidelines	2
c.	Number of Chapter 1 students by subject areas	3
d.	Unduplicated count of Chapter 1 participants	4
e.	Program description (teachers, hours per week, etc.)	5
f.	Program description (narrative)	6
g.	Participant achievement scores	7
h.	Sustained gain information	8
i.	Other participant outcomes (SPECIFY) _____ _____	9
j.	Other (SPECIFY) _____ _____	10

C. MONITORING

C-1. Who monitors the facilities' Chapter 1 N or D programs?

SEA only	1	
The SAA only	2	(SKIP TO QUESTION D-1)
The SEA and SAA	3	

C-2. About what percent of facilities' Chapter 1 N or D programs are monitored on-site by the SEA . . .

a.	Not monitored on site	_____%
b.	Less than once a year	_____%
c.	Once a year	_____%
d.	Twice a year	_____%
e.	More than twice a year	_____%
f.	More than three times a year	_____%
	TOTAL FACILITIES WITH N OR D PROGRAMS	100%

C-3. In what areas does the SEA monitor the facilities' Chapter 1 N or D programs? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY.)

a.	Maintenance of effort	1
b.	Comparability	2
c.	Size, scope and quality of program	3
d.	Needs assessment	4
e.	Application of eligibility criteria	5
f.	Evaluation	6
g.	Sustained gains	7
h.	Program improvement	8
i.	Other (SPECIFY) _____ _____	9

C-4. Under what conditions does the SEA monitor facilities Chapter 1 N or D programs on-site? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY.)

a.	At the request of the SAA	1
b.	At the request of the facility	2
c.	On a routine basis	3
d.	Other (SPECIFY) _____ _____	4

D. AUDITS

D-1. What agency performs fiscal audits of the facilities?

State Education Agency Staff	1
State Applicant Agency Staff	2
State Audit Agency Staff	3
Independent Contractors	4
Other (SPECIFY) _____ _____	5

D-2. How often are fiscal audits conducted?

Once a year	1
In alternate years	2
Other (SPECIFY)_____	
_____	3

D-3. Are other types of audits conducted at the facilities?

Yes	1	
No	2	(SKIP TO QUESTION E-1)

D-4. For each type of audit conducted, please indicate who conducts the audit and how often the audit is conducted.

Type of audit	The agency which conducts the audit	How often the audit is conducted
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

E. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

E-1. In the last fiscal year, did the SEA provide assistance to the facilities in any of the following areas?

		Yes	No
a.	Designing a needs assessment	1	2
b.	Setting up evaluation procedures	1	2
c.	Setting up sustained effect procedures	1	2
d.	Selecting program participants	1	2
e.	Testing issues (administration, selection, interpreting results)	1	2
f.	Analyzing program evaluation results	1	2
g.	Completing required reports	1	2
h.	Improving Chapter 1 N or D projects	1	2
i.	Instructional areas (curriculum development)	1	2
j.	Other (SPECIFY)_____ _____	1	2

E-2. Does the SEA have an agreement with the Chapter 1 Technical Assistance Center (TAC) that serves your State?

Yes	1	
No	2	(SKIP TO QUESTION F-1)

E-3. Does the TAC provide assistance to State agency N or D staff as part of that agreement?

Yes 1
No 2

E-4. Does the TAC provide assistance to facility N or D staff as part of that agreement?

Yes 1
No 2

F. STATE EDUCATION AGENCY TRANSITIONAL SERVICES

F-1. Does the SEA require that the SAA use some portion of Chapter 1 funds for transitional services?

Yes 1
No ..... 2 (SKIP TO QUESTION G-1)

F-2. Briefly describe the required Chapter 1 funded transitional services for students in juvenile facilities.

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

F-3. Briefly describe the required Chapter 1 funded transitional services for students in adult correctional facilities.

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

G. SEA/SAA COORDINATION

G-1. What methods does this agency typically use and use most frequently to communicate with the SAA on matters related to the administration of the Chapter 1 N or D program?

		Methods used (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)	Used most frequently (CIRCLE ONLY ONE)
a.	Verbally–informal conversation	1	1
b.	Verbally–formal, scheduled meetings	2	2
c.	Written–informal notes	3	3
d.	Written–formal exchange of information	4	4
e.	Other (SPECIFY) _____ _____	5	5

G-2. Considering all of the forms of communication you reported above, how often does this agency communicate with the SAA(s) on matters related to the administration of the Chapter 1 N or D program? (CIRCLE ONLY ONE RESPONSE.)

a.	Daily	1
b.	A few times per week	2
c.	Once a week	3
d.	A few times per month	4
e.	Once per month	5
f.	Once per quarter	6
g.	Rarely	7
h.	Never	8

H. FISCAL INFORMATION

H-1. The SEA Chapter 1 N or D allocation for FY 1987-88 is shown below. Please verify the amount by circling the number or write in the correct amount below.

a.	FY 1987-88 allocation	$_____
b	Corrected FY 1987-88 allocation	$_____

H-2. How much of that amount was retained and used for SEA administration of the Chapter 1 N or D program? ..... $_____

H-3. Identify the source of other funds that are used for SEA administration of the Chapter 1 N or D program. (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY.)

a. No other funds are used 1
b. State education funds 2
c. Chapter 1 State administrative funds 3
d. Other (SPECIFY) _____
_____ 4

J. SEA STAFF

J-1. Please enter the number and full-time equivalent (FTE) of SEA staff who are assigned to Chapter 1 N or D. Enter FTE to one decimal place..

a. _____
NUMBER OF STAFF

b. _____
FTEs

J-2. In what year did the current SEA Chapter 1 N or D Coordinator assume these duties? ..... 19_____

J-3. About what percent of the SEA Chapter 1 N or D Coordinator's time was spent on the N or D program during the 1987-88 fiscal year? ..... _____%

J-4. What are the most important problems in administering the N or D program?

1. _____
_____
2. _____
_____
3. _____
_____

J-5. What, if anything, would you change about the Chapter 1 N or D Federal program?

1. _____
_____
2. _____
_____
3. _____
_____

J-6. Name, title, and telephone number of person completing this form. This information is needed so that we will know whom to contact if we have any questions.

_____

NAME (Please print)

_____

TITLE

_____

AREA CODE/PHONE NUMBER

THANK YOU FOR YOUR ASSISTANCE

Respondent ID:

OMB No.: 1885-0512
Expiration date: 9/90

STUDY OF THE ECIA CHAPTER 1 NEGLECTED OR DELINQUENT PROGRAM

Chapter 1 Teacher Questionnaire

This survey is part of a major national assessment of the Chapter 1 Neglected or Delinquent (N or D) program sponsored by the U.S. Department of Education.

A nationally representative sample of teachers with Chapter 1 classes in facilities with N or D programs is being asked to complete this questionnaire. Although you are not required to respond, your cooperation is needed to make the results of the survey comprehensive and accurate. The information in this questionnaire will be treated confidentially and will be reported only in the aggregate; therefore, you should not record your name on the questionnaire.

This questionnaire pertains to the Chapter 1 programs in your facility. It is to be completed only by teachers who have at least one Chapter 1 class.

Study conducted by:

Westat, Inc.
1650 Research Blvd.
Rockville, MD 20850
(800) 937-8281

In affiliation with:

Policy Studies Associates, Inc.
1718 Connecticut Ave., N.W.
Washington, DC 20009
and
Research & Training Associates
75 Corporate Woods
10800 Farley
Overland Park, KS 66210

Please return questionnaire to Chapter 1 study team leader in the envelope provided.

PART A: BACKGROUND

A-1. At the end of this school year, how many total years will you have been teaching at this facility? _____

A-2. Please indicate whether you teach full-time or part-time at this facility by circling the appropriate number.

Full-time	1
Part-time	2

A-3. Please enter the number of years of experience you have had in each of the settings below. Enter zero "0" wherever appropriate.

a. Teaching other than Chapter 1 in correctional institutions _____

b. Teaching Chapter 1 in correctional institutions _____

c. Teaching other than Chapter 1 in public or private school settings _____

d. Teaching Chapter 1 in public or private school settings _____

e. Non-teaching position in correctional setting _____

A-4. What is the highest level of schooling or degree that you have completed?

No college degree or certificate	1
Certificate or degree based on less than four years of college	2
Bachelor's degree	3
Beyond Bachelor's degree but not a Master's or Doctorate	4
Master's degree	5
Beyond Master's degree but not a Doctorate	6
Doctoral degree	7
Other (SPECIFY)_____ _____	8

A-5. Do you have a valid State teaching certificate?

Yes	1	
No	2	(SKIP TO QUESTION A-7)

A-6a. Do you hold a State teaching certificate or credentials in the area(s) in which you are currently teaching?

Yes	1
No	2

A-6b. Please indicate the level (e.g., elementary, secondary, adult) and area (e.g., English, remedial instruction, cosmetology) of your teaching certificate.

1. Level: _____

2. Area: _____

A-7. If you could choose, where would you like to work? (CIRCLE ONLY ONE.)

I would work in this facility	1
I would work in another correctional facility	2
I would work in a regular public school	3
I would work in a regular private school	4
Other (SPECIFY)_____	5

A-8. In which of the following areas do you have formal coursework (i.e., college/graduate credit course), in-service (staff development) training, or prior work experience? (CIRCLE THE NUMBER FOR ALL THAT APPLY.)

		(1) Formal coursework	(2) In-service training	(3) Prior work experience
a.	Remedial instruction in mathematics	1	1	1
b.	Remedial instruction in reading	1	1	1
c.	Diagnosis of special learning problems	1	1	1
d.	Counseling or social work	1	1	1
e.	Education in a correctional setting	1	1	1

A-9. During the last three years, how many hours of staff development/in-service training have you had in areas related to instructional planning or presentation? ..... _____

A-10. During the last three years, how many college-level or graduate-level courses have you had in areas related to instructional planning or presentation? ..... _____

PART B: TEACHING RESPONSIBILITIES

B-1. Please indicate how many months you taught in this facility during 1988. ..... _____

B-2 What Chapter 1 subjects are your currently teaching? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY.)

a.	Chapter 1 reading	1
b.	Chapter 1 language arts	2
c.	Chapter 1 mathematics	3
d.	Chapter 1 combined reading/language arts and mathematics	4
e.	Chapter 1 socials skills/life skills	5
f.	Other Chapter 1 instruction (SPECIFY)_____ _____	6

B-3. On a typical day, how many Chapter 1 classes do you teach? ..... _____

B-4. Do you currently teach any regular education (non-Chapter 1) classes at this facility?

Yes	1	
No	2	(SKIP TO QUESTION B-7)

B-5. In what subjects are you currently teaching non-Chapter 1 classes? (CIRCLE THE ONE (1) FOR ALL THAT APPLY.)

a.	Reading	1
b.	Language arts	1
c.	Mathematics	1
d.	Social studies	1
e.	Science	1
f.	Social skills/life skills	1
g.	Adult basic education	1
h.	English as a second language/bilingual education	1
i.	Other remedial instruction	1
j.	GED preparation	1
k.	Vocational education	1
l.	Post-secondary classes	1
m.	Other (SPECIFY) _____	1

B-6. On a typical day, how many non-Chapter 1 classes do you teach? ..... _____

B-7. Please estimate the number of hours you spend each week performing the following. Include Chapter 1 and any non-Chapter 1, if applicable.

		Hours per Week
a.	Instruction inside the classroom	_____
b.	Classroom preparation	_____
c.	Conversation with students, outside the classroom	_____
d.	Staff meetings or in-service training	_____
e.	Other responsibilities (SPECIFY)	
	_____	_____
	_____	_____

B-8. Thinking only of your Chapter 1 responsibilities, approximately what percent of your time in the Chapter 1 classroom is spent in the following activities?

a.	Academic interaction	_____%
b.	Personal/social development of students	_____%
c.	Noninstructional tasks (e.g., attendance)	_____%
d.	Other classroom activities	_____%
	TOTAL CHAPTER 1 CLASSROOM TIME	100%

B-9. Of the Chapter 1 classroom time you spend in academic interaction, approximately what percentage is spent in the following activities?

a.	Presenting and/or explaining information	_____%
b.	Monitoring students' academic performance	_____%
c.	Providing feedback to students on their academic performance	_____%
d.	Other academic interaction activities	_____%
	TOTAL CHAPTER 1 ACADEMIC INTERACTION	100%

B-10. Of the Chapter 1 classroom time spent on noninstructional activities, approximately what percentage is spent in the following activities?

a.	Behavior management	_____%
b.	Management tasks (e.g., distributing materials, giving directions, reporting attendance)	_____%
c.	Other noninstructional activities	_____%
	TOTAL CHAPTER 1 NONINSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES	100%

B-11. For a typical Chapter 1 class, please estimate the percentage of class time that students are actively engaged in academic activities. _____%

B-12. Please indicate how often students are absent from your Chapter 1 classes for the following reasons. (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER ON EACH LINE.)

		Almost never	Sometimes	Frequently
a.	Work detail	1	2	3
b.	Counseling	1	2	3
c.	Security or disciplinary reasons	1	2	3
d.	Other institutional activities	1	2	3

B-13. Are any problems created for you as a teacher by the security measures at this facility? Please read each option and circle the one (1) beside all that apply.

a. Security measures create no problems for me..... 1

b. Classes are often shut down for security reasons..... 1

c. There is a lack of free movement between classrooms..... 1

d. There is a lack of adequate security..... 1

e. Classroom doors have to be locked..... 1

f. Equipment has to be locked up and is hard to get at..... 1

g. Classroom materials are subject to censorship..... 1

h. Groups of students are restricted from coming to class..... 1

i. Certain groups of students are not allowed in the same classroom together..... 1

j. Custody personnel interfere with the educational program..... 1

k. Other (SPECIFY)_____ 1

PART C: RESOURCES

C-1. Please indicate the frequency with which you use each of the instructional materials listed below. (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER ON EACH LINE.)

Materials	Frequency of Use: Never used	Seldom used	Occasional use	Frequent use	Very frequent use
a. Textbooks	1	2	3	4	5
b. Teacher-developed materials	1	2	3	4	5
c. Programmed materials	1	2	3	4	5
d. Workbooks and practice sheets	1	2	3	4	5
e. Manipulative materials (e.g., games, puzzles)	1	2	3	4	5
f. Life skills materials (e.g., newspapers, forms, applications)	1	2	3	4	5
g. Audiovisual equipment and materials (e.g., tapes, tape recorders, films)	1	2	3	4	5
h. Computers	1	2	3	4	5
i. Computer software	1	2	3	4	5
j. Vocational education equipment and material	1	2	3	4	5

C-2. Which, if any, of the materials listed above are not available in sufficient quantity to meet your instructional needs?

_____

_____

_____

C-3. Are the materials you use for teaching Chapter 1 primarily at the students' (CIRCLE ONE.):

Grade level,	1
Achievement level, or	2
English language proficiency level?	3
None of the above is primary	4

C-4. Do you think the materials you use match the students':

	Yes	No
a. Ability levels?	1	2
b. Age levels?	1	2
c. English language proficiency levels?	1	2

PART D: TEACHING METHODS

D-1. Please circle the one number that most closely resembles how Chapter 1 services are provided to the majority of students in your classes.

Chapter 1 students are instructed by a regular classroom teacher, and you provide Chapter 1 services in their regular classroom	1
Chapter 1 students are instructed by a regular classroom teacher, and students leave their regular classroom for part of the day to receive Chapter 1 services from you	2
You provide all of the Chapter 1 students' academic instruction, and yours is the Chapter 1 student's regular classroom	3

D-2. Do you plan Chapter 1 course content based on:

	Yes	No
a. Standardized achievement test scores?	1	2
b. Standardized diagnostic test scores? (Diagnostic tests identify specific weaknesses)	1	2
c. Criterion or objective referenced test scores?	1	2

D-3. Which of the following are contained in individual plans for students?

	Yes	No
a. Individual student performance objectives	1	2
b. Planned sequence of courses	1	2
c. Timeframe for achievement of objectives	1	2
d. Supplementary services required	1	2
e. We have no individual plans for students	1	2

D-4. How often are individual student performance objectives updated? (CIRCLE ONE.)

We have no individual student performance objectives	1
We have individual student performance objectives, but they are not updated after they are established	2
Daily	3
Weekly	4
Monthly	5
Less than monthly	6

D-5. Which one of the following statements best describes the educational approach you <u>most frequently</u> use in your classes?

Totally individualized learning	1
Small-group learning	2
Whole-class learning	3

D-6. Besides your own judgement, do you use any of the following to tell you how well a Chapter 1 student is progressing in the subjects you teach?

	Yes	No	D-6x. IF YES: Do you use it only at entry or other times? Entry	Other
a. Standardized achievement test scores	1	2	1	2
b. Standardized diagnostic test scores	1	2	1	2
c. English language proficiency test scores	1	2	1	2
d. Criterion or objective referenced test scores	1	2	1	2
e. Individualized skills inventory	1	2	1	2
f. Other teachers' judgements	1	2	1	2

D-7. In evaluating your Chapter 1 students' academic progress, do you consult with or use information from other teachers or aides?

Yes 1
No ..... 2 (SKIP TO QUESTION D-9)

D-8. Do you use information from any of the following in evaluating Chapter 1 student progress?

	Yes	No	NA
a. The students' other regular classroom teachers	1	2	3
b. Aides	1	2	3
c. Other Chapter 1 teachers	1	2	3
d. Other compensatory education or remedial teachers_____	1	2	3
e. Any other teachers (SPECIFY)_____ _____	1	2	3

D-9. How frequently do you share, either formally or informally, information about the progress of your Chapter 1 students with:

	At least weekly	At least monthly	Several times year	Never	NA
a. Your students?	1	2	3	4	
b. Your students' other teachers?	1	2	3	4	5
c. Other treatment staff?	1	2	3	4	

D-10. How often do you:

	At least weekly	At least monthly	Several times/ year	Once/ year	Never	NA
a. Meet with educational administrative staff to identify program needs?	1	2	3	4	5	6
b. Participate in meetings on education program plans/procedures?	1	2	3	4	5	6
c. Participate in meetings on Chapter 1 program plans/procedures?	1	2	3	4	5	6

	Yes	No	NA
D-11. Are you and the non-Chapter 1 teachers both involved in the development of written lesson plans for Chapter 1 students?	1	2	3
D-12. Do you meet with non-Chapter 1 teachers to discuss the instructional needs of your Chapter 1 students?	1	2	3

D-13. Do you use a curriculum series to teach Chapter 1?

Yes 1
No ..... 2 (SKIP TO QUESTION D-15)

D-14. Is this the same curriculum used in the students' regular classroom?

Yes	1
No	2
This is the students' regular classroom	3

D-15. Which of the following statements best describes the content of the Chapter 1 instruction provided in this facility? (CIRCLE ONLY ONE.)

These services introduce materials not taught in the/a regular classroom;	1
These services reinforce material from the regular classroom	2

PART E: OPINIONS AND PERCEPTIONS

E-1. The following statements describe possible attitudes and behaviors of education administrators regarding the Chapter 1 program. Circle one number on each line to indicate your level of agreement with each statement.

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree
a. Education administrators have established goals for the Chapter 1 program and clearly articulate them	1	2	3	4	5
b. Education administrators communicate positive attitudes about the Chapter 1 program to students, teachers, and other institution staff	1	2	3	4	5
c. Education administrators plan cooperatively with Chapter 1 teachers to implement program improvement efforts	1	2	3	4	5
d. Education administrators actively support the Chapter 1 program	1	2	3	4	5
e. Education administrators demonstrate interpersonal and organizational management skills	1	2	3	4	5
f. Education administrators observe classroom instruction and provide helpful feedback to teachers	1	2	3	4	5

E-2. Please indicate how often each of the following occurs in your Chapter 1 classroom instruction.

	Almost never	Sometimes	Frequently	Almost always
a. Students seek clarification about directions	1	2	3	4
b. Reteaching is provided	1	2	3	4
c. Students are asked questions to check for understanding	1	2	3	4
d. Students work at academic tasks that provide them with at least 80% rates of success	1	2	3	4
e. Opportunities are provided for skill and knowledge application to real-life situations	1	2	3	4
f. Feedback on student performance is specific and refers to skill competencies	1	2	3	4
g. Feedback on student performance is immediate	1	2	3	4

E-3. Please indicate how often the following descriptions are characteristic of your teaching.

	Almost never	Sometimes	Frequently	Almost always
a. I communicate high achievement expectations to students	1	2	3	4
b. I clearly express the belief that all students can learn	1	2	3	4
c. I communicate respect, interest, and caring to students	1	2	3	4
d. I set challenging yet realistic goals for students	1	2	3	4
e. I incorporate student choice of learning activities into my classroom practices	1	2	3	4

E-4. Thinking of your students who are receiving Chapter 1 services, do you strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree with the following statements:

	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
a. With proper instruction Chapter 1 students can learn about as well as any other students	1	2	3	4
b. No matter how good the instruction, these students will always score lower than average	1	2	3	4
c. These students do not want to learn	1	2	3	4
d. These students may want to learn but they do not have the right background for schoolwork	1	2	3	4
e. These students have more trouble learning than other students	1	2	3	4
f. They have shorter attention spans	1	2	3	4
g. Improving the student's self-concept as a learner is particularly important for these students	1	2	3	4

E-5. What do you believe are the three most important factors that promote learning in your classroom(s)?

a. _____

_____

b. _____

_____

c. _____

_____

E-6. What do you believe are the three most important factors that obstruct learning in your classroom?

a. _____

_____

b. _____

_____

c. _____

_____

THANK YOU

OMB No.: 1885-0512
Expiration date: 9/90

STUDY OF THE ECIA CHAPTER 1 NEGLECTED OR DELINQUENT PROGRAM

Survey of State Applicant Agencies

LABEL

DIRECTIONS

This questionnaire concerns the State Applicant Agency (SAA) and its role in administering the Chapter 1 Neglected or Delinquent (N or D) program in your State. In States with more than one State Applicant Agency, each is being requested to respond to similar questions regarding its role in the N or D program. Independent of this request, the State Education Agency (SEA) is also being surveyed regarding its role.

This questionnaire seeks information on the State Applicant Agency application and evaluation requirements; SAA monitoring, auditing, and technical assistance; finance and staffing. Most questions ask that you circle one or more numbers that best describe Chapter 1 N or D in your State. Some items ask for a brief narrative response. A very limited number of items ask for statistical information. Estimates are important if exact data are not available. Please indicate a figure is an estimate by parentheses. We recognize that in some agencies all the information requested in this form may not be available to a single person. If this is the case, we encourage you to refer such items to the most knowledgeable person, whether on your staff or in another office within the agency identified on the label.

All questions should be answered on the basis of facilities for which this agency is responsible. For example, if the Department of Corrections oversees Chapter 1 in adult correctional facilities and the Department of Social Services oversees facilities for youthful offenders, each department is asked to complete a separate questionnaire regarding Chapter 1 N or D in the facilities it administers.

Although you are not required to respond, your cooperation is needed to make the results of the survey comprehensive and accurate. Please use the enclosed prepaid envelope to return the questionnaire to:

Westat, Inc.
ATTN: Linda LeBlanc
1650 Research Boulevard
Rockville, Maryland 20850

A. CHAPTER 1 NEGLECTED OR DELINQUENT PROGRAM APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS

A-1. How often must facilities apply to your agency for N or D program funds?

Annual application required	1	
Every 3 years with annual updates	2	
Other (SPECIFY) _____	3	
No application is needed	4	(SKIP TO QUESTION A-4)

A-2. Are there areas in which facilities issue assurances or provide data concerning Chapter 1 to your agency?

Yes	1	
No	2	(SKIP TO QUESTION A-4)

A-3. Circle the number for each area in which facilities issue assurances to this agency.

a. Maintenance of effort	1	
b. Comparability	2	
c. Needs assessment	3	
d. Evaluation	4	
e. Sustained gains	5	
f. Other (SPECIFY) _____	6	

A-4. Do any facilities, that do not participate in the Chapter 1 N or D program, have 10 or more residents eligible for Federal funding (i.e., under age 21 and without high school diplomas)?

Yes	1	
No	2	(SKIP TO QUESTION A-6)

A-5. What are the reason(s) they do not participate? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY.)

a. No educational program	1	
b. Short term facility	2	
c. Application/evaluation requirements	3	
d. Other (SPECIFY) _____	4	

A-6. Does this agency have a minimum standard different than the State Education Agency (SEA) standard (e.g., test score, number of years below grade level, etc.) that determines student eligibility for receipt of Chapter 1 services?

Yes, we have a different standard	1	
No, we use the SEA standard	2	(SKIP TO QUESTION A-8)
No, there is no minimum standard	3	(SKIP TO QUESTION A-8)

A-7. Please describe the minimum standard used to determine eligibility for Chapter 1 N or D services.

_____

_____

A-8. Was a standard (different than the SEA standard) used to determine student eligibility for Chapter 1 N or D services during the 1981-82 fiscal year (the last operational year of Title I)?

Yes, we used a different standard than the SEA	1	
No, we used the SEA standard	2	

A-9. Is this a different standard than the one that is currently used?

Yes	1	
No	2	(SKIP TO QUESTION A-12)

A-10. Please describe the minimum standard that was used in FY 1981-82 to determine student eligibility for N or D services.

_____

_____

_____

_____

A-11. Please describe the reason(s) for the minimum standard change from 1981-82 to 1987-88.

_____

_____

_____

_____

A-12. Is there a curriculum focus from this agency that is used for Chapter 1 N or D programs at the facility level?

Yes	1	
No	2	(SKIP TO QUESTION B-1)

A-13. Please describe the curriculum focus.

_____

_____

_____

_____

B. SAA REQUIREMENTS FOR PROGRAM EVALUATION

B-1. How often must facilities submit Chapter 1 N or D program evaluations to your agency (the SAA)?

Once a year	1
Every two years	2
Every three years	3
Other (SPECIFY) _____	
_____	4

B-2. What is required in the Chapter 1 N or D program evaluation submitted to this agency? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY.)

a.	Number of students eligible for Chapter 1 under Federal funding guidelines	1
b.	Number of students eligible to receive services under State guidelines	2
c.	Number of Chapter 1 students by subject area	3
d.	Unduplicated count of Chapter 1 participants	4
e.	Program description (teacher/student ratios, hours per week, etc.)	5
f.	Program description (narrative)	6
g.	Participant achievement information	7
h.	Sustained gain information	8
i.	Other participant outcomes (SPECIFY) _____ _____	9
j.	Other (SPECIFY) _____ _____	10

C. MONITORING

C-1. Who monitors the facilities' Chapter 1 N or D programs?

The SEA only	1	(SKIP TO QUESTION D-1)
The SAA only	2	
The SEA and SAA	3	

C-2. About what percent of facilities' Chapter 1 programs are monitored on-site by the SAA . . .

a.	Not monitored on site	_____%
b.	Less than once a year	_____%
c.	Once a year	_____%
d.	Twice a year	_____%
e.	Three times a year	_____%
f.	More than three times a year	_____%
	TOTAL FACILITIES WITH N OR D PROGRAMS	100%

C-3. In what areas does this agency monitor facilities? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY.)

a.	Maintenance of effort	1
b.	Comparability	2
c.	Size, scope and quality of program	3
d.	Needs assessment	4
e.	Application of eligibility criteria	5
f.	Evaluation	6
g.	Sustained gains	7
h.	Progam improvement_____	8
i.	Other (SPECIFY) _____	
	_____	9

D. AUDITS

D-1. What agency performs fiscal audits of the facilities?

State Education Agency staff	1
State Applicant Agency staff	2
State audit agency staff	3
Independent contractors	4
Other (SPECIFY)_____	
_____	5

D-2. Does this agency conduct other types of audits of the facilities?

Yes 1
No ..... 2 (SKIP TO QUESTION E-1)

D-3. Please indicate what type of audit is conducted and how often the audit is conducted.

Type of audit	How often the audit is conducted
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

E. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

E-1. In the last fiscal year, who provided assistance to the facilities in each of the following areas? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY FOR EACH ITEM.)

		SEA	SAA	Consultant/ other
a.	Designing a needs assessment	1	2	3
b.	Setting up evaluation procedures	1	2	3
c.	Setting up sustained effects procedures	1	2	3
d.	Selecting program participants	1	2	3
e.	Testing issues (administration, selection, interpreting results)	1	2	3
f.	Analyzing program evaluation results	1	2	3
g.	Completing required reports	1	2	3
h.	Improving Chapter 1 N or D projects	1	2	3
i.	Microcomputer technology	1	2	3
j.	Instructional areas (curriculum development)	1	2	3
k.	Other (SPECIFY) _____ _____	1	2	3

E-2. Does the Chapter 1 Technical Assistance Center (TAC) provide service to this agency's staff?

Yes 1
No 2

E-3. Does the TAC provide service to the facilities served by this agency?

Yes 1
No 2

F. STATE APPLICANT AGENCY TRANSITIONAL SERVICES

F-1. Does this agency require that facilities use some portion of Chapter 1 funds for transitional services?

Yes 1
No ..... 2 (SKIP TO QUESTION G-1)

F-2. Briefly describe the required Chapter 1 funded transitional services for students in juvenile facilities.

_____

_____

_____

_____

F-3. Briefly describe the required Chapter 1 funded transitional services for students in adult correctional facilties.

_____

_____

_____

_____

G. AGENCY/FACILITY COORDINATION

G-1. In general, how often does this agency communicate with the typical facility on matters related to the implementation of the Chapter 1 program? (CIRCLE ONLY ONE RESPONSE.)

Daily 1
A few times per week 2
Once a week 3
A few times per month 4
Once per month 5
Once per quarter 6
Rarely 7
Never ..... 8 (SKIP TO QUESTION H-1)

G-2. What methods does this agency typically use and most frequently use to communicate with facilities on matters related to the implementation of the Chapter 1 N or D program?

		Methods used (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)	Method used most frequently (CIRCLE ONLY ONE)
a.	Verbally - informal conversation	1	1
b.	Verbally - formal scheduled meetings	2	2
c.	Written - informal notes	3	3
d.	Written - formal exchange of information	4	4
e.	Other (SPECIFY) _____		
	_____	5	5

H. FISCAL INFORMATION

H-1. What was this agency's Chapter 1 N or D allocation for the 1987-88 fiscal year? ..... $_____

H-2a. How much of the allocation was retained by your agency for Chapter 1 N or D administration? ..... $_____

H-2b. How much of the allocation was passed on to facilities for programs? ..... $_____

H-3. Identify the source(s) of other funds that are used for administration of the Chapter 1 N or D program. (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY.)

a.	No other funds are used	1
b.	State education funds	2
c.	Regular Chapter 1 funds	3
d.	SAA general funds	4
e.	Other (SPECIFY) _____	
	_____	5

H-4 How are funds allocated to various institutions?

	Methods used (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)	Most important method (CIRCLE ONLY ONE)
Allocation based on number of eligible residents	1	1
Allocation based on facility request in application	2	2
Allocation based on type of education program operating	3	3
Other (SPECIFY)_____		
_____	4	4

H-5. For the 1987-88 fiscal year, indicate the amount expended for Chapter 1 administration in each of the following categories.

a. Personnel costs..... $_____

b. Equipment/materials..... $_____

c. Travel..... $_____

d. Other (SPECIFY) _____
_____ $_____

TOTAL..... $_____

J. PROGRAM SIZE

J-1. Indicate the number of facilities under the jurisdiction of this agency and the number which operate Chapter 1 N or D programs, by type of facility. (ENTER NA IF NO FACILITIES OF THIS TYPE ARE UNDER YOUR AGENCY'S JURISDICTION.)

	Number of facilities:	
	Total under agency	With Chapter 1 programs
a. Neglected facilities		
b. Juvenile facilities		
c. Adult correctional facilities		

J-2. Indicate the number of residents who were eligible (under age 21, without a high school diploma) for Federal Chapter 1 N or D funding on or about October 15, 1988 and the number who actually were receiving services on the same date. (REPORT ONLY YOUTH IN FACILITIES FOR WHICH THIS AGENCY HAS RESPONSIBILITY.)

	Number of residents on or about October 15, 1988:	
	Eligible for Federal funding	Receiving N or D services
a. Neglected facilities		
b. Juvenile facilities		
c. Adult correctional facilities		

J-3. Indicate the total number of youth who were eligible for Federal Chapter 1 N or D funding during FY87 and the total number who received services during FY87. Report only youth in facilities for which this agency has responsibility.

	Total for fiscal year	
	Eligible for Federal funding	Receiving N or D services
a. Neglected facilities		
b. Juvenile facilities		
c. Adult correctional facilities		

K. STATE APPLICANT AGENCY STAFF

K-1. Indicate the number and full time equivalent (FTE) of this agency's staff who are currently assigned to Chapter 1 N or D. (ENTER FTE TO ONE DECIMAL PLACE.)

a. _____
NUMBER OF STAFF

b. _____.____
FTE

K-2. In what year did the SAA's Chapter 1 Coordinator assume these duties? ..... 19____

K-3. What percent of the SAA Chapter 1 N or D Coordinator's time was spent in administering the program during the 1987-88 fiscal year ..... ___.____%

K-4. Indicate the total number of instructional staff, funded in whole or in part by Chapter 1 N or D, in fiscal year 1987-88. Also indicate the full-time equivalent (FTEs) number of this staff. Report only instructional staff at facilities for which this agency is responsible.

	N or D Instructional Staff	
	Number	FTEs (round to one decimal)
a. Neglected facilities		
b. Juvenile facilities		
c. Adult correctional facilities		

K-5. What are the three most important problems in administering the Chapter 1 N or D program?

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____

K-6. What, if anything, would you change about the Chapter 1 N or D Federal program?

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____

K-7. Name, title, and telephone number of person completing this form. This information is needed so that we will know whom to contact if we have any questions.

_____

NAME (Please print)

_____

TITLE

_____

AREA CODE/PHONE NUMBER

THANK YOU FOR YOUR ASSISTANCE

OMB No.: 1885-0512
Expiration date: 9/90

STUDY OF THE ECIA CHAPTER 1 NEGLECTED OR DELINQUENT PROGRAM

Survey of State-Operated Delinquent Youth and Adult Correctional Facilities

LABEL

DIRECTIONS

This questionnaire is designed to be completed by the facility's Education Program Administrator. In responding to certain items, however, it may be necessary to consult with the facility's Chapter 1 program coordinator (if other than the education program administrator), the Superintendent of the facility, or other facility staff, to obtain the requested information.

Unless otherwise specified all questionnaire items pertain to Fiscal Year 1988. Whenever a count of residents is requested we have used on or about October 15, 1988 as a point of reference. If data are not available for this time, please enter your most recent figures.

Before proceeding to Part A, please take a moment to review the enclosed glossary.

Please use the prepaid envelope to return the completed questionnaire to:

Westat, Inc.
ATTN: Linda LeBlanc
1650 Research Boulevard
Rockville, Maryland 20850

Please do not leave items blank. If exact data are not available for a particular item, please give us your best estimate. Indicate that the figure is an estimate by parentheses ( ). Estimates are important if exact data are not available.

PART A: GENERAL INFORMATION

A-1. What is the resident capacity of this facility? ..... _____

A-2. What was the total resident population of the facility on or about October 15, 1988? ..... _____

A-3. About what percent of the total population of this facility is held in each of the security levels listed below?

a.	Minimum	_____%
b.	Medium	_____%
c.	Maximum	_____%
d.	Other (specify)_____	_____%
	TOTAL	100%

PART B: FACILITY BUDGET AND EXPENDITURES

B-1. Please enter the approximate total facility operating budget for FY 1988, including any amount budgeted for education or other services that may have a separate budget..... $_____

B-2. Please estimate in the columns below the total funds allocated for all education services in your facility for FY 1988 from all sources, from Chapter 1, and from other Federal sources. (Education services include remedial academic and vocational instruction; education staff salaries; materials supplies, equipment; in-service education, etc. Please do not include salaries of custody staff assigned to education area; janitorial services, etc.) Enter zero if there were no carry-over funds.

		EDUCATION ALLOCATION	
		FY 1988 Funds received	Funds carried over from previous years
a.	Total funds allocated for education services from all sources	$_____	$_____
b.	Chapter 1 funds only	$_____	$_____
c.	Other Federal funds (non-Chapter 1)	$_____	$_____

B-3. Please indicate the approximate amount of all education funds and the amount of Chapter 1 funds expended in each of the following categories for FY 1988.

		EDUCATION EXPENDITURES	
		Chapter 1 only	Total
a.	Total education staff salaries & benefits	$_____	$_____
b.	Instructional materials (include textbooks, exclude computers)	$_____	$_____
c.	Computer hardware and software	$_____	$_____
d.	Staff training and development (include travel)	$_____	$_____
e.	Other (SPECIFY)_____	$_____	$_____
f.	TOTAL	$_____	$_____

PART C: FACILITY STAFFING

C-1. Please indicate the total number of all staff persons and the number of full-time equivalent (FTE) staff in this facility in the personnel categories indicated below. (ENTER FTE TO ONE DECIMAL PLACE.)

		FACILITY STAFF	
	STAFF CATEGORY	Number of Staff	FTE Staff
a.	Administrative/clerical	_____	_____.__
b.	Corrections/security/custodial	_____	_____.__
c.	Treatment staff (education, health social services)	_____	_____.__
d.	Other (SPECIFY)_____		
	_____	_____	_____.__
e.	TOTAL	_____	_____.__

C-2. Please enter the number of Chapter 1 funded and total staff positions (full-time and part-time), at your facility in each of the educational categories listed below.

EDUCATION STAFF CATEGORY	NUMBER OF EDUCATION STAFF: Chapter 1 funded only	NUMBER OF EDUCATION STAFF: Total staff
a. Education administrators	_____	_____
b. Resource and curriculum specialists	_____	_____
c. Teachers	_____	_____
d. Paid aides	_____	_____
e. Educational counselors	_____	_____
f. Other (SPECIFY)_____		
_____	_____	_____
g. TOTAL	_____	_____

C-3. Please enter the number of funded Chapter 1 and total FTEs in each of the educational categories listed below. (ENTER FTE TO ONE DECIMAL PLACE.)

EDUCATION STAFF CATEGORY	FTE EDUCATION STAFF: Chapter 1 funded only	FTE EDUCATION STAFF: Total staff
a. Education administrators	___.___	___.___
b. Resource and curriculum specialists	___.___	___.___
c. Teachers	___.___	___.___
d. Paid aides	___.___	___.___
e. Educational counselors	___.___	___.___
f. Other (SPECIFY)_____		
_____	___.___	___.___
g. TOTAL	___.___	___.___

C-4. How many teachers at this facility are:

	NUMBER OF TEACHERS
a. State certified?	_____
b. State certified in the areas they teach?	_____

C-5. What has been the average length of service:

		YEARS
a.	For all teachers currently at this facility?	_____
b.	For Chapter 1 teachers currently at this facility?	_____

C-6. Do instructional staff at this facility belong to the State civil service system?

Yes	1
No	2
Some do, others do not	3
No State civil service system	4

C-7. Who has primary responsibility for selecting instructional staff at this facility? (CIRCLE ONLY ONE RESPONSE.)

Superintendent/warden	1
Principal/education program administrator	2
State corrections official	3
State corrections education official	4
State education agency official	5
Other State-level official (SPECIFY)_____ _____	6
Other (SPECIFY)_____ _____	7

C-8. How does the compensation received by this facility's instructional staff compare with that received by similarly qualified staff of the nearest local public education system(s)?

Much lower compensation at this facility	1
Somewhat lower compensation at this facility	2
Equal compensation at this facility	3
Somewhat higher compensation at this facility	4
Much higher compensation at this facility	5
Do not know	6

C-9. During this school year, have the following characteristics or attitudes of instructional staff been a serious problem, somewhat of a problem, or not at all a problem at this school? (CIRCLE ONLY ONE ANSWER FOR EACH ITEM.)

		Serious problem	Somewhat of a problem	Not a problem
a.	Recruitment	1	2	3
b.	Absenteeism	1	2	3
c.	Turnover	1	2	3
d.	Relations with students	1	2	3
e.	Satisfaction with their jobs	1	2	3

C-10. Approximately what percentage of the educational program staff are:

White, not Hispanic	_____%
Black, not Hispanic	_____%
Hispanic	_____%
American Indian or Alaskan Native	_____%
Asian or Pacific Islander	_____%
TOTAL	100%

C-11. What percent of education program staff are:

Male	_____%
Female	_____%
TOTAL	100%

PART D: RESIDENT INFORMATION

D-1. Please provide the information requested below for Chapter 1 participants, total education program participants, and the total facility population, on or about October 15, 1988. (Enter 0 wherever appropriate.)

		NUMBER OF PERSONS		
		Chapter 1 participants only	Total education program participants	Total population
a.	Total	_____	_____	_____
b.	Gender			
1.	Male	_____	_____	_____
2.	Female	_____	_____	_____
c.	Age Range			
1.	Under 10 years	_____	_____	_____
2.	10-13 years	_____	_____	_____
3.	14-17 years	_____	_____	_____
4.	18-20 years	_____	_____	_____
5.	21 years and over	_____	_____	_____
d.	Race/Ethnicity			
1.	White, not Hispanic	_____	_____	_____
2.	Black, not Hispanic	_____	_____	_____
3.	Hispanic	_____	_____	_____
4.	American Indian or Alaskan Native	_____	_____	_____
5.	Asian or Pacific Islander	_____	_____	_____

D-2. What was the average length of stay for the persons released in FY 1988? _____

D-3. Please estimate the number of all residents held for each of the following reasons, on or about October 15, 1988 (or the last date for which this data is available). (Unduplicated count)

a. Homicide, manslaughter ..... _____

b. Assault, rape, sexual assault, and kidnapping ..... _____

c. Robbery ..... _____

d. Property offenses (includes burglary, arson, autotheft, forgery, fraud, larceny, and possession of stolen property) ..... _____

e. Drug offenses ..... _____

f. Public order offenses ..... _____

g. Other offenses (SPECIFY)_____

_____ _____

h. TOTAL ..... _____

PART E. REGULAR EDUCATION SERVICES

E-1. Is there a written statement describing the philosophy and goals of this facility's educational program?

a. Yes ..... 1 (PLEASE ATTACH A COPY OF THIS STATEMENT TO THE QUESTIONNAIRE AND RETURN TO WESTAT.)

b. No 2

E-2. Please indicate where instructional activities take place at this facility. (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY.)

a. In a residential building at this facility 1

b. In a nonresidential building(s) at the facility 2

c. Off the grounds of this facility 3

d. Other (SPECIFY)_____

_____ 4

E-3. Is the educational program(s) at this facility currently accredited by any of the following? (CIRCLE ONE RESPONSE FOR EACH ITEM.)

		Yes	No
a.	State department of education	1	2
b.	Vocational association(s)	1	2
c.	Regional commission of colleges and schools	1	2
d.	Commission on Accreditation for Corrections	1	2
e.	Other (SPECIFY)_____		
	_____	1	2

E-4. About how many residents were enrolled in the educational program at the facility on or about October 15, 1988? ..... _____

E-5. Please enter the number of students enrolled in each of the following educational programs at this facility, on or about October 15, 1988. Please enter "NA" if a program is not offered at this facility. (DUPLICATE COUNTS MAY BE APPROPRIATE.)

		Number
a.	Adult basic education	_____
b.	Basic skills education	_____
c.	General Educational Development (GED) preparation	_____
d.	High-school level classes	_____
e.	Postsecondary instruction	_____
f.	Special education instruction	_____
g.	Vocational education	_____
h.	Other (SPECIFY) _____	
	_____	_____

E-6. What are the number of hours per week and the total number of weeks per year of instruction available to students at this facility who participate in each of the regular education programs listed below?

		Hrs./week	Total weeks per year
a.	Adult basic education	_____	_____
b.	Basic skills education	_____	_____
c.	General Educational Development (GED) preparation	_____	_____
d.	High-school level classes	_____	_____
e.	Postsecondary instruction	_____	_____
f.	Special education instruction	_____	_____
g.	Vocational.....	_____	_____
h.	Other (SPECIFY)_____	_____	_____
	_____	_____	_____

E-7. How frequently is student achievement measured through standardized achievement tests at this facility? (CIRCLE ONLY ONE CODE.)

Never	1	(SKIP TO QUESTION E-9)
Only upon entry	2	
At entry and exit from the facility	3	
At entry and at regular intervals (SPECIFY intervals)_____	4	
Varies by student	5	

E-8. Are all persons entering your institution who are under age 21 and without a high-school diploma given an achievement test at your facility (and/or at a diagnostic center) prior to their entry into one of your educational programs?

Yes	1
No	2

E-9. How are students selected for participation in the education program in the facility? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY.)

a.	All residents participate	1
b.	All residents willing to participate are allowed to do so	2
c.	Personal recommendations of institutional staff are the basis for selection	3
d.	Selection is determined on basis of tests given at a diagnostic/reception center or at the facility	4
e.	Other (SPECIFY)_____ _____	5

E-10. Is participation in the education program required for those:

		Yes	No
a.	Under the State compulsory education age?	1	2
b.	Over the State compulsory education age?	1	2

E-11. What incentives, if any, are used to encourage residents to participate in the facility's educational programs. (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY.)

a.	Payment for attendance	1
b.	Access to other programs upon completion	2
c.	Credit toward "good time" or early release	3
d.	Certificate of completion	4
e.	Field trips	5
f.	Other (SPECIFY)_____ _____	6

E-12. With respect to your education staff's ability to meet student learning needs, please indicate the extent to which the following items present problems for you. (CIRCLE ONE RESPONSE FOR EACH ITEM LISTED.)

		Serious problem	Somewhat of a problem	Not a problem
a.	Inadequate funding	1	2	3
b.	Inadequate books, tools, and other educational materials (exclude computers)	1	2	3
c.	Shortage of instructional materials related to student needs	1	2	3
d.	Lack of computers	1	2	3
e.	Lack of software (computer, workbooks, texts, etc.)	1	2	3
f.	Shortage of qualified teachers	1	2	3
g.	Limited facility space conducive to learning	1	2	3
h.	Insufficient supplementary staff (remedial specialists, media specialists, etc.)	1	2	3
i.	Insufficient supportive staff (counselors, psychologists, etc.)	1	2	3
j.	Inadequate inservice training for staff	1	2	3
k.	Lack of adequate liaison with treatment staff	1	2	3
l.	Conflicts with custody concerns of facility	1	2	3
m.	Conflicts with other institutional progams for residents (e.g., jobs, counseling, etc.)	1	2	3
n.	Low student motivation	1	2	3
o.	Insufficient support from facility administrators	1	2	3
p.	Poor educational follow-up with aftercare agencies	1	2	3

PART F: CHAPTER 1 SERVICES

F-1. By the end of this school year, how many years will this facility have operated a Chapter 1/Title 1 program? _____

F-2. Do all students in the education program receive Chapter 1 services?

Yes 1
No 2

F-3. How are students selected for participation in Chapter 1? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY.)

All students who are eligible (under 21 and having no high school diploma) participate 1

All eligible students who are willing to participate are allowed to do so 2

Personal recommendations are made by staff members (e.g., teacher or counselor observations) 3

On the basis of test scores ..... 4 (ANSWER QUESTIONS F-4a AND F-4b)

Other (SPECIFY)_____ 5

F-4a. If students are selected for participation in Chapter 1 entirely or partly by means of a test, what is the name of the test?

_____

NAME OF TEST

F-4b. What scores are used for Chapter 1 selection? (COMPLETE ONE RESPONSE.)

a. Scoring below the _____ percentile on the test.
b. Scoring _____ years below grade level on the test.
c. Other (SPECIFY)_____

_____

F-5. Please indicate the number of residents in each of the categories below, on or about October 15, 1986.

	Number of residents/students
a. Number of residents eligible for Chapter 1, by federal eligibility standards (i.e., all residents under the age of 21, without a high school diploma)	____ ____
b. Number of residents eligible for Chapter 1, by facility eligibility standards (this may be the same or smaller than F-5a)	_____
c. Number of students receiving Chapter 1 services	_____

F-6. Please provide the numbers of Chapter 1 participants who were receiving services in each of the following project components (duplicated counts), on or about October 15, 1988. If a component is not offered, please enter "NA" in the appropriate space.

	CHAPTER 1 INSTRUCTION	Number of Chapter 1 students
a.	Chapter 1 Reading	
b.	Chapter 1 Language arts	
c.	Chapter 1 Mathematics	
d.	ESL	
e.	Combined reading, language arts, math and/or ESL	
f.	Study skills	
g.	Counseling	
h.	Social or life skills	
i.	Transitional services	
j.	Other Chapter 1 instructional component (SPECIFY) _____	
	_____	

F-7. What are the number of hours per week and the total number of weeks per year scheduled for Chapter 1 instruction in each of the following program components? (ENTER NA IF DON'T HAVE.)

	CHAPTER 1 INSTRUCTION	Hrs./week	Weeks per year
a.	Chapter 1 reading		
b.	Chapter 1 language arts		
c.	Chapter 1 mathematics		
d.	ESL		
e.	Combined reading, language arts, math and/or ESL		
f.	Study skills		
g.	Counseling		
h.	Social or life skills		
i.	Transitional services		
j.	Other Chapter 1 instructional component (SPECIFY) _____		
	_____		

PART G: OTHER RESIDENT SERVICES

G-1. Please estimate the percentage of residents, on or about October 15, 1988 who received the following services and circle any services which are funded in whole, or in part by Chapter 1. Enter NA if the service is not provided.

		Percent receiving service	Circle if funded by Chapter 1
a.	Counseling	_____%	1
b.	Job readiness/pre-employment training	_____%	2
c.	Occupational skill training	_____%	3
d.	Job placement	_____%	4
e.	Life skills training	_____%	5
f.	Alcohol/drug abuse services	_____%	6
g.	Health education	_____%	7
h.	Computer literacy instruction	_____%	8
i.	Parenting training	_____%	9
j.	Other (SPECIFY) _____	_____%	10
	_____	_____%	10
	_____	_____%	10

G-2. Does this facility offer any of the following services to help youth return to the regular, public education system, or the community in general? Are any of these services funded by Chapter 1? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

		Offered by facility	Funded in whole or part by Chapter 1
a.	Identification of employment opportunities	1	1
b.	Assignment to supervised residences	2	2
c.	Help in registering in local public schools	3	3
d.	Other (SPECIFY)_____		
	_____	4	4

G-3. What are the most important problems in implementing the Chapter 1 program?

1. _____

_____

2. _____

_____

3. _____

_____

G-4. What, if anything, would you change about Chapter 1 at your facility?

1. _____

_____

2. _____

_____

3. _____

_____

G-5. Name, title, and telephone number of person completing this form. This information is needed so that we will know whom to contact if we have any questions.

_____

NAME (Please print)

_____

TITLE

_____

AREA CODE/PHONE NUMBER

THANK YOU FOR YOUR ASSISTANCE